

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXX.

BALTIMORE, MAY, 1915.

No. 5.

RHETORICAL CONTRASTS IN SCHILLER'S DRAMAS

I

Will and purpose have possibly never carried on a more truceless war with accident and chance than they did in the case of Schiller. From the time he entered the Karlsschule until irremediable affliction obliged him to dictate *Demetrius*, he experienced an almost perfect series of victories and defeats. His life was not like that of Kleist who lost, as time went on, health and money, love, friendship, and fame. Schiller won some of these, which only made the loss of the others more pronounced. Yet he fought on for the reconciliation of the ideal and the real. He tried without abatement and with success to make life, his life, a work of art, and to portray all life as he felt a real artist should. He felt, as did Nietzsche later, that the existence of the world is justified only as an aesthetic phenomenon. And, seeing that the world contains a superabundance of sweat and dirt, he consciously bowed before the idealistic imperative which bade him never cease poetizing sweetness and light. Throughout all of his works we find him emphasizing the fact that the tawdry and the low are depressingly common, and insisting that art can, and consequently should, memorialize the beautiful and elevate the vulgar. And his rare ability as a rhetorician in the best sense of the word aided him greatly in the accomplishment of his task, for he was a master at linguistic *Helldunkel*.

Though Schiller's style abounds in conceits peculiar only to himself, one of the most peculiar and most effective of these, by way of introductory explanation, is seen in *Semele*, ll. 354-356:

. . . denn Wollust ist's
Den Göttern, Menschen zu beglücken; zu verderben
Die Menschen, ist den Göttern Schmerz. . . .

First we notice the pairs of contrasts: "Götter-Menschen," "beglücken-verderben," "Wollust-Schmerz." And then we note the force of what amounts to emphasis by repetition: naturally, if it gives the gods an enrapturing sort of pleasure to make mortals happy, it must pain them greatly to destroy mortals entirely. Since Schiller's style has been studied but little, and this phase of it not at all, simply to allow this matter to pass in review shows that it is a rich field, the exhaustion of which would result in a contribution of uncommon value.

To begin at the beginning, *Der Abend* (1776) is the earliest¹ poem by Schiller that has been preserved. The first four verses run as follows:

Die Sonne zeigt, vollendend gleich dem Helden,
Dem tiefen Thal ihr Abendangesicht.
(Für andre, ach! glücksel'gre Welten
Ist das ein Morgenangesicht).

That is to say, the setting sun in one hemisphere means the rising sun in another—a contrast and a parallel. Schiller's last poetic work was *Die Huldigung der Künste*. Even the casual reader can hardly fail to appreciate the use made of contrasts in this poem, despite the fact that it deals with the seven closely related major arts. In the ballads alone there is no conspicuous use of contrasts. In *Der Ring des Polykrates* we have one strophe that contains Schiller's most fundamental tenet, in contrast form, on the value of adversity:

Drum, willst du dich vor Leid bewahren,
So flehe zu den Unsichtbaren,
Dass sie zum Glück den Schmerz verleihen.
Noch keinen sah ich fröhlich enden,
Auf den mit immer vollen Händen
Die Götter ihre Gaben streuen.

It is of interest, however, in this connection to see how, in his essay *Über Bürgers Gedichte*,

¹ Cf. Gustav Schwab's *Schillers Leben*, p. ix, which refers to a still earlier poem of 1775. This, too, contains a contrast. In it Schiller has "die Jugend" offering us "Rosenhände," while "das Alter" brings us "Hörner oder die Pistolen gar."

he praises Bürger's *Balladen* as being incomparable, but the burden of his whole discourse concerning Bürger's *Gedichte* is that one misses "die Idealisierkunst." When quoting from Bürger he in two instances selects a passage that contains a contrast. For example, in *Blümchen Wunderhold*, these verses interested Schiller:

Du theilst der Flöte weichen Klang
Des Schreiers Kehle mit
Und wandelst in Zephyrengang
Des Stürmers Poltertritt.

And so these contrasts occur throughout Schiller's works. In the distichs written in collaboration with Goethe, those by Schiller can almost invariably be determined by the contrasts. It is hardly necessary to refer to the use made of them in *Würde der Frauen*, according to which woman is chaste, vigilant, graceful, modest, and pious, while man is passionate, careless, rough, impetuous, impious, and so on. *Das Ideal und das Leben* (1795) is built on the same plan. *Die Worte des Glaubens* (1797) begins: "Drei Worte nenn' ich euch." *Die Worte des Wahns* (1799) begins: "Drei Worte hört man." The expressions referred to in the first poem are "Freiheit," "Tugend," and "Gott," those in the second, "die goldene Zeit," "das buhlende Glück," "irdischer Verstand." That Schiller thought of these two poems as the counterpart the one of the other is self-evident. The fourth book of his *Geschichte des dreissigjährigen Kriegs* closes as follows:

"So fiel Wallenstein, nicht weil er Rebell war,
sondern er rebellierte, weil er fiel. Ein Unglück für
den Lebenden, dass er eine siegende Partei sich zum
Feinde gemacht hatte—ein Unglück für den Toten,
dass ihn dieser Feind überlebte und seine Geschichte
schrieb."

Concerning his works on the various phases of aesthetics, we can lay aside all reserve and assert that they constitute an unending round of contrasts and parallels.² And even in his

²In the first of the *Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen*, Schiller writes: "Wie der Scheidekünstler, so findet auch der Philosoph nur durch Auflösung die Verbindung und nur durch die Marter der Kunst das Werk der freiwilligen Natur."

letters Schiller frequently employed this device. He wrote (July 21, 1797) to Körner concerning the Humboldts as follows:

"Alexander Humboldt ist mir ehrwürdig durch
den Eifer und Geist, mit dem er sein Fach betreibt.
Für den Umgang ist Wilhelm geniessbarer. Alex-
ander hat etwas Hastiges und Bitteres, das man bei
Männern von grosser Thätigkeit häufig findet. Wil-
helm ist mir sehr lieb geworden, und ich habe mit
ihm viele Berührungspunkte."

Those who look upon this as a mere incident of fact will find numerous other passages in Schiller's correspondence where he went out of his way to bring in this sort of construction. And, finally, we do not find contrasts and parallels in the works of other writers translated by Schiller.³ On reading these we feel at once that this is not Schiller, this is Shakespeare, or Racine, or Euripides, and so on.

Now, had Schiller not employed contrasts before becoming acquainted with the thesis-antithesis-synthesis formula (Kant-Hegel) of his day, one might be led to believe that it was a matter of acquired rather than of innate technique. But this would not cover the case. It came natural to Schiller to use contrasts at first, and later he consciously developed the conceit. He knew he was doing it, just as Heine knew he was making frequent use of the verb "lachen" in his creative works, or as Richard Wagner knew he was using "lachen" and "Wahn" very frequently. Schiller's instinctively dramatic mind impelled him to spend the major part of his life poetizing the ever-recurring conflict between the good and

³If we could find many strong contrasts in Racine's *Phädra* as Schiller has translated it, that would suggest a number of things. But in the entire drama there are only three that remind of Schiller, and the most striking of these is the exact opposite of Schiller. Hippolyt says (IV, 2) to Theseus:

Wie die Tugend, hat das Laster seine Grade;
Nie sah man noch unschuldige Schüchternheit
Zu wilder Frechheit plötzlich übergehen.

We do not, to be sure, find sudden transitions in Schiller from positive to negative, but he does accentuate the two by juxtaposition. As to transitions, Johanna's "Der schwere Panzer wird zum Flügelkleide" is only a romantic trope.

the bad. The contrast construction lends itself best to dramatic compositions, and it is in his dramas that we find it most conspicuously applied. But as to the application of this device, it is safe to become wholly dogmatic and say that it is always a matter of rhetoric, never of psychology.

There are about seventy-five such constructions in *Die Räuber* (1780). At the very beginning, Franz Moor draws a contrast between himself and Karl Moor. Karl, in turn, contrasts the present with the past in the familiar words (I, 2): "Mir ekelt vor diesem tintenklecksenden Säkulum, wenn ich in meinem Plutarch lese von grossen Menschen." And in Karl's fight against convention he says (I, 2): "Das Gesetz hat zum Schneckengang verdorben, was Adlerflug geworden wäre." Even in the Latin spoken by Grimm (I, 2) we have a contrast. But the real Schiller in this regard is seen in Moor's remarks to Schwarz (III, 2):

"Ich habe die Menschen gesehen, ihre Bienen Sorgen und ihre Riesenprojekte—ihre Götterpläne und ihre Mäusegeschäfte, das wunderseltene Rennen nach Glückseligkeit;—dieser dem Schwung seines Rosses anvertraut—ein anderer der Nase seines Esels," etc.

There is no point in quoting all of it, or in tabulating all similar instances. Schiller clearly delighted in emphasizing the virtuous by setting it face to face with the vicious. And to say that he was fond of contrasts in scenes⁴ neither explains nor weakens the significance of his linguistic contrasts. To say, however, that the contrasts of this drama smack of Rousseau⁵ is to throw light on Schiller's language.

⁴ Cf. *Schiller-Lexikon*, by Karl Goldbeck and Ludwig Rudolph, Berlin, 1890, Vol. 2, p. 261: "In Spiegelberg sehen wir Schillers Neigung zur Zusammenstellung wirksamer Kontraste in höchst glücklicher Weise in Erscheinung treten; denn während Karls rein tragischer Charakter uns zu tief ernstem Nachsinnen Veranlassung gibt, ist Spiegelberg eine grotesk-komische Figur; er ist eine vollendete Parodie des Helden unserer Tragödie."

⁵ Such contrasts as the following are common: "Ein Holzapfel, weisst du wohl, wird im Paradiesgärtlein selber ewig keine Ananas" (II, 3). And such parallels as these are also common: "Aber was hier zeitliches Leiden war, wird dort ewiger

In his next and weakest drama, *Fiesco* (1782), sharp contrasts are again numerous⁶ and similar to those in *Die Räuber*. A number are taken from the animal and plant world. Gianettino says to Julia: "Schwester, bist du doch stets von Schmetterlingen umschwärmt und ich von Wespen" (III, 8). Fiesco says to Zenturione: "Binsen mögen vom Atem knicken. Eichen wollen den Sturm" (II, 5). The figure reminds one of Kleist,⁷ while the entire scene argues that Schiller was just then reading either Aesop or Rousseau, or both. Some of the contrasts in this drama are finely shaded. Verrina, for example, shows why purple is the royal color: "Der erste Fürst war ein Mörder und führte den Purpur ein, die Flecken seiner That in dieser Blutfarbe zu verstecken" (V, 16). Antitheses also occur. Leonore says to Fiesco (IV, 14):

"Liebe hat Thränen und kann Thränen verstehen; Herrschsucht hat eherne Augen, worin ewig nie die Empfindung perlt—Liebe hat nur ein Gut, thut Verzicht auf die ganze übrige Schöpfung: Herrschsucht hungert beim Raube der ganzen Natur.—Herrschsucht zertrümmert die Welt in ein rasselndes Kartenhäus, Liebe träumt sich in jede Wüste Elysium."

One can, to be sure, feel the naturalness of contrasts—in scenes—in this drama, written as it was to portray the relative rôles of plan and chance⁸ in human life, and written when

Triumph; was hier endlicher Triumph war, wird dort ewige unendliche Verzweiflung" (V, 1). The expression, finally, that caused Schiller some embarrassment is only a strong contrast: "Reis' du ins Graubündner Land, das ist das Athen der heutigen Gauner" (II, 3).

⁶ One is almost too ready to cry bombast on studying the contrasts in this drama. For example, "Dass du den Galgen für einen Zahnstocher ansehen sollst" (I, 9), or, "Ist wohl feuerfester als Eurer ehrlichen Leute: sie brechen ihre Schwüre dem lieben Herrgott; wir halten sie pünktlich dem Teufel" (I, 9).

⁷ Cf. Kleist's "ein Frühlingssonnenstrahl reift die Orangenblüthe, aber ein Jahrhundert die Eiche."

⁸ Cf. A. Schoell: *Über Schillers Fiesco*, Weimarisches Jahrbuch, I, 132: "Die Verschwörung des Fiesco zu Genua im Jahre 1547 hat zu ihrer Zeit viel Aufsehen gemacht und ist ein beliebter Gegenstand für die Darstellung geblieben wegen des Contrastes von Plan und Zufall, mit dem sie uns erschüttert."

Schiller⁹ himself was now jubilant over bright prospects and now cast down by the misfortunes that had befallen him.

As to contrasts, *Kabale und Liebe* (1784) differs but slightly from the preceding dramas. Sharp contrasts in individual word-pairs are not so numerous, references to nature are rarer, well-balanced sentences are again introduced, and the oxymoron is used for the first time. General contrasts are abundant;¹⁰ there are, however, none in Gemmingen's *Der deutsche Hausvater* (1780), the play that suggested a number of things to Schiller. One example of each of these phases of the matter must suffice. Ferdinand says to Lady Milford: "Wenn auch Klugheit die Leidenschaft schweigen heisst, so redet die Pflicht desto lauter" (II, 3). Passages in which duty is set over against love are frequent, as are also such pairs as "Herz-Geschlecht," "kalte Liebefeurige Pflicht," "britische Fürstin-deutsches Volk,"—one of Schiller's first contrasts between nations. As to nature, Luise says:

"Fühlt sich doch das Insekt in einem Tropfen Wassers so selig, als wär' es ein Himmelreich, so froh und so selig, bis man ihm von einem Weltmeer erzählt, worin Flotten und Walfische spielen."

Concerning well-balanced sentences, Ferdinand says to von Kalb (IV, 3):

"Wenn du genossest, wo ich anbetete? Schwelgtest, wo ich einen Gott mich fühlte! Dir wäre besser, Bube, du flühest der Hölle zu, als dass dir mein Zorn im Himmel begegnete."

⁹In the preface to *Fiesco* Schiller writes: "Ich habe in meinen Räubern das Opfer einer ausschweifenden Empfindung zum Vorwurf genommen. Hier versuche ich das Gegenteil, ein Opfer der Kunst und Kabale."

¹⁰One of the striking features of the contrasts in this drama is their intensity, their association with the great human passions, and their occasional coarseness. Frau Miller, for example, suggests that her husband may secure a position in the Ducal Orchestra; to which Miller replies: "Orchester!—Ja, wo du Kupplerin den Diskant wirst heulen und mein blauer Hinterer den Konterbass vorstellen!" (II, 4).

As to the oxymoron,¹¹ Luise says to Lady Milford: "Warum wollen alle Menschen so grausam-barmherzig sein?" (IV, 7). There are, of course, in this drama strong contrasts in scenes; but these did not make linguistic contrasts indispensable.¹²

Though contrasts in scenes and characters follow each other in rapid succession in *Don Carlos* (1787),¹³ rhetorical contrasts are, in proportion to the length of the drama, not so numerous;¹⁴ there are about sixty in all. This is undoubtedly due to no mere accident. Schiller, tired of Storm and Stress, decided to break away from the naturalism of his more juvenile period of prose, and in so doing he chose, for the first time, the restraint imposed by the iambic pentameter. This verse form, coupled with the complicated and refractory theme, gave the young dramatist—he was still in his twenties—a good deal to think about. We find, however, what would be, for other dramatists, frequent employment of contrasts even here. Some of the more conspicuous ones

¹¹Schiller used the oxymoron rarely. In *Die Jungfrau*, l. 2869, occurs "menschenreiche-Öde," and in *Tell* we have "Bauernadel," l. 824. It seems that the oxymoron was not strong enough for his purpose, that it was too unreal, too cryptic. The expression "asphaltischer Sumpf" in the 35th *Xenium* is hardly an oxymoron.

¹²Cf. Ernst Müller, *Schillers Kabale und Liebe*, Tübingen, 1892, p. 71: "Auch hier (Luise—Lady Milford) tritt Schillers Neigung hervor, seine Frauencharaktere in scharfem Kontrast einander gegenüberzutreten zu lassen, wie schon vorher in *Fiesco* und später in *Maria Stuart*." But this has nothing to do with linguistic contrasts.

¹³Cf. *Schiller-Lexikon*, I, 217: "Wer Schillers vorwiegende Neigung zur überraschenden Zusammenstellung von Gegensätzen kennt, wird dieses höchst werthvolle Kunstmittel auch in dem Scenenwechsel angewendet finden, wo ja fortdauernd zwei Handlungen, die Intrigue und die Bekämpfung derselben, neben einander herlaufen müssen." But this does not cover the matter of linguistic contrasts.

¹⁴One cannot, however, read this drama without noticing how Schiller returns again and again to this scheme. For example, the König says (ll. 2522–2523): "Euer Haar ist silbergrau, und Ihr erröthet nicht." The oddness of his not becoming red in the face could have been emphasized without referring to the fact that his hair was silvery gray.

are in the scenes between Carlos and the Königin, and have to do with mental states. Carlos says (ll. 750-752):

Sie sind für mich verloren—O, in diesem
Gefühl liegt Hölle—Hölle liegt im andern,
Sie zu besitzen.

Others concern differences in dignity. Philipp says (ll. 1176-1177) to Carlos:

Du redest, wie ein Träumender. Dies Amt
Will einen Mann und keinen Jüngling.

And the counterpart to this is found in Carlos's remark (ll. 1660-1662) to the Prinzessin:

Der gute Vater
Besorgt, wenn ich Armeen kommandierte—
Mein Singen könnte drunter leiden.

Occasionally a contrast is based on a situation in nature,¹⁵ as in Marquis Posa's famous speech on freedom in nature (ll. 3217-3235). Two of the most important contrasts in the last two acts are in the reply of the Grossinquisitor to the König (ll. 5194-5208) and in Carlos's remarks (ll. 5294-5297) to the Königin. Taken as a whole, this drama on civic freedom of thought does not show a striking use of Schiller's favorite conceit. Posa-Schiller's overweening idealism left but little room for a discussion of life's realities.

From 1787 to the completion of *Wallensteins Lager* (October, 1798), Schiller studied history, philosophy, art, and poetry, and wrote some of his best-known poems. His mind was consequently mature when he began final work on his fifth drama. The *Lager* shows, however, no important development in the use of contrasts, aside from their increased frequency. We have the last line of the prologue, "Ernst ist das Leben, heiter ist die Kunst," the long list of antithetic puns in the speech of the Kapuziner, "Rheinstrom-Peinstrom," "Bistümer-Wüsttümer" (ll. 500-623), the Kürassier's observation on Heaven's inability to please everybody at the same time, one man wanting

rain while the other wants sunshine (ll. 970-975), and the sharp contrasts in the soldiers' song at the end, in which the free and fascinating life of the "Wehrstand" is set over against the slavish, unattractive life of the "Nährstand." These are all that stand out, but there are many minor ones.¹⁶ And it is indeed just these minor ones that first show conclusively that the conceit became with time, if it was not at first, almost a linguistic obsession with Schiller. That they cannot be classified is proof of their general attraction for him. They range from purely practical ones to others on states of mind.

In *Die Piccolomini* (December, 1798), Schiller made, as is well known, most consistent use of contrasts in scenes.¹⁷ The public and the domestic, the loyal and the treacherous, the military and the civil, the ideal and the real follow each other with the uniformity of stripes in a plaid. One sees that Schiller is making broader use of contrasts; it is no longer a matter of mere rhetoric but of dramaturgy. Well-balanced sentences occur. Buttler says to Questenberg (ll. 251-256):

Noch gar nicht war das Heer. Erschaffen erst
Musst' es der Friedland, er empfing es nicht,
Er gab's dem Kaiser! Von dem Kaiser nicht
Erhielten wir den Wallenstein zum Feldherrn.
So ist es nicht, so nicht! Vom Wallenstein
Erhielten wir den Kaiser erst zum Herrn.

Such sentences lead one to believe that Schiller now employs the scheme consciously. One new phase is introduced by reason of the astrological references. Thekla explains to Max the stars (ll. 1594-1618); melancholy Saturn, warlike Mars, joyful Venus, cheerful Jupiter, the Moon, the Sun, each plays a definite rôle. Indeed, all the stellar matter is an affair of contrasts. And as to general contrasts such as are found

¹⁵ In the 1106 lines there are over 100 contrasts.

¹⁶ Cf. also ll. 2515-2518, where "glühend Gold" is sharply contrasted with "Wasser," which the König needed to quench his feverish thirst.

¹⁷ Cf. *The Life and Works of Friedrich Schiller*, by Calvin Thomas, 1901, p. 349: "Schiller was a lover of contrast, and in his skillful use of it lies a large part of his effectiveness as a playwright. To a large extent his contrasts are made to order; that is, they proceed from the vision of the artist calculating an effect, rather than from the observation of life as it is."

in the earlier dramas, they are uncommonly numerous.¹⁸

In *Wallensteins Tod* (March, 1799), Schiller plays battledore and shuttlecock with contrasts. They occur on every page. Wallenstein's monologue (ll. 139-222) is a poetic dramatization of the "Doppelsinn des Lebens." The dialogue between Wallenstein and Wrangel (ll. 223-410) is an unending round of comments on things as they are in contrast with things as they were; on what is and what should be. The Gräfin says to Wallenstein (ll. 614-617):

Was damals
Gerecht war, weil du's für ihn thatst, ist's heute
Auf einmal schändlich, weil es gegen ihn
Gerichtet wird?

The Gefreiter says to Wallenstein (ll. 1941-1943):

Du führtest uns heraus ins blut'ge Feld
Des Todes, du, kein andrer, sollst uns fröhlich
Heimführen in des Friedens schöne Fluren.

Wallenstein sounds the keynote of the drama in his remark to Max (ll. 2126-2127):

Denn Krieg ist ewig zwischen List und Argwohn,
Nur zwischen Glauben und Vertraun ist Friede.

In Max's heart, two voices are fighting for supremacy (l. 2280). Gordon assures Wallenstein of victory (ll. 3649-3651):

Und Friedland, der bereuend wiederkehrt,
Wird höher stehn in seines Kaisers Gnade,
Als je der Niegefallne hat gestanden.

¹⁸ In order to determine the exact number of contrasts in this drama from a disinterested point of view, the writer assigned to one of his students, Miss Lucy G. Cogan, the task of collecting them. Miss Cogan found 176 contrast constructions. A careful reading of the drama, however, by way of checking up the account forced the writer to reject about 50 of these on the ground that the contrast idea was not sufficiently pronounced to justify separate comment. Such lines (444-445), for example, as:

Der seltne Mann will seltenes Vertrauen.
Gebt ihm den Raum, das Ziel wird er sich setzen.

imply a contrast but do not of themselves contain it.

And finally Schiller rises to an even higher ironical, that is, implied, contrast in Wallenstein's last words (ll. 3677-3679):

Ich denke einen langen Schlaf zu thun,
Denn dieser letzten Tage Qual war gross,
Sorgt, dass sie nicht zu zeitig mich erwecken.

It is, of course, not surprising to find in Schiller's greatest drama an intense conflict between two parties. This is merely good dramaturgy; but it is only the beginning of the matter. All sorts of conflicts surge to and fro with the regularity of the tide of the sea. "Liebe-Hass," "Treue-Verrat," "Wahrheit-Lüge," "Freundschaft-Feindschaft," "Sieg-Niederlage," "Hoffnung-Verzweiflung," "Zusammenkommen-Auseinandergehen," "Leben-Tod,"—these are the pairs that help to make the drama so effective. And it is their constant use that argues that the scheme was Schiller's own. Kleist's *Prinz von Homburg* is also effective, while it is much more poetic; and it is based on the immediate results of the same war. But one searches Kleist's drama in vain for rhetorical and linguistic contrasts.¹⁹ And one reads Schiller's other dramas in vain for more persistent and effective use of contrasts.

And yet, one almost tires of marking lines in *Maria Stuart* (June, 1800) in which rhetorical contrasts occur.²⁰ Society occupied Schiller's attention in his first three dramas, cosmopolitanism in his fourth, fatalism in his fifth, the distinct personality of just one person, *Maria Stuart*, in his sixth. We find, therefore, the greater part of the contrasts centered

¹⁹ We do, to be sure, find an approach to linguistic contrasts in the various speeches of the *Prinz* (ll. 354-364, 831-840, 1000-1003, 1829-1838), but they do not have Schiller's clarity, directness, and forcefulness.

²⁰ Even by adopting a rigid standard, there are about 110 instances of strong contrast in *Maria Stuart*. One cannot help but notice Schiller's scheme in lines 3840-3843. Leicester says:

Stürzt dieses Dach nicht sein Gewicht auf mich!
Thut sich kein Schlund auf, das elendste
Der Wesen zu verschlingen!

In other words, if he is not crushed from above, he will be engulfed from below.

around this illustrious woman, who had done great wrong and to whom, from Schiller's point of view, even greater wrong had been done. This explains the frequent recurrence of such pairs as the following: "Gatte-Buhle," "üppiges Leben-Mangel," "Schmach-gekröntes Haupt," "Flattersinn-Schwermut," "dumpe Predigtstube-leuchtende Verklärung," "euer gutes Recht-euer ganzes Unrecht," "Personen-Amt," "ein englisches Gefängnis-die Wohlthat der Gesetze," "der königliche Gast-der Bettler," "sein-scheinen," "Brautgemach-Tode," "Ehen-Ketten," "Freund-Feind," "Ihr Leben ist dein Tod-Ihr Tod dein Leben," "ärmste Hirtin-grösster Fürst," "Gunst-Strafe," "Teppich der Wiesen-die traurige Gruft," "Königin-Gefangene," "Liebe-Rache," "handeln-schwatzen," "das Zeitliche-das Ewige," "schwarzer Block-blankgeschliffenes Beil," "das Wort-der Wille," "Sie trug auf ihren Armen mich ins Leben-sie leite mich mit sanfter Hand zum Tod," and so on. Now, it would be difficult to find another drama in which the two conflicting parties are so sharply set over against each other as in this drama with Elizabeth's Protestant England at war against France's Catholic Mary. While this does not mean that Schiller was obliged to use so many rhetorical contrasts, it is nevertheless his use of contrasts that makes us feel so keenly the division between the two parties. In Swinburne's *Mary Stuart*, for example, we do not find so many antithetical expressions. Swinburne impresses us poetically, Schiller rhetorically. Swinburne's English is elegant and pleasing; Schiller's German is logical and effective.

England and France are also the conflicting parties in *Die Jungfrau von Orleans* (April, 1801), but here the situation is totally different, owing to the long leap which Schiller took into the realm of romanticism. The heroine and the time treated, the variety of verse and strophe forms, the splendor and operatic pomp, the tendency to the heroic-epic, the supernatural in its various manifestations,—all of these are Schiller's tribute to the romantic trend of his time. When one reads the *Jungfrau*, one moves in the atmosphere of Tieck's *Genoveva* (1799),

and such an atmosphere does not lend itself well to the use of sharp, direct contrasts. Nor do we find a large number of this type. The drama closes with the oft-quoted line,

Kurz ist der Schmerz, und ewig ist die Freude,

Sorel describes Dunois (ll. 862-863) as a soldier who speaks crudely and sternly but acts civilly and gently, Burgund says (ll. 2028-2029) of Johanna,

Wie schrecklich war die Jungfrau in der Schlacht,
Und wie umstrahlt mit Anmut sie der Friede,

Johanna addresses (ll. 3466-3469) the Deity with

Du kannst die Fäden eines Spinngewebes
Stark machen wie die Tauen eines Schiffes;
Leicht ist es deiner Allmacht, ehr'ne Bande
In dünnes Spinngewebe zu verwandeln.

And in other places we find such contrasts, where, as becomes evident on careful reading, they were not indispensable. That is, it was not a question of reporting on an actual situation; it was a question of heightening the effect by setting the very strong over against the very weak. Shakespeare's *Henry VI*, Part I, treats the same theme, but it is wholly without such linguistic contrasts. And in this drama Shakespeare is very inferior to Schiller from the standpoint of dramatic effectiveness.²¹

The most significant feature of the contrasts in this drama is their romanticism; they are more detailed, more poetic. And of this type there are many. Karl explains (ll. 476-485) to Du Chatel the beneficent influence of minstrels on an otherwise dull court in this way. The entire reconciliation scene (II, 9) with Burgund—a scene which resembles those in Goethe's *Iphigenie* in which Iphigenie heals

²¹ Cf. Act IV, Scene 3. York says:

He dies, we lose; I break my warlike word.
We mourn, France smiles; we lose, they daily get.
This is a mere matter of fact; Shakespeare was neither consciously nor unconsciously trying to heighten the dramatic effect by the use of contrasts. And the same is true of the other cases in which Shakespeare faintly resembles Schiller.

Orest, and in which strong contrasts are not used—is developed on the same plan. The Erzbischof's comparison between the letting loose of war by the powerful and the letting loose of the falcon by the hunter is all a matter of romantic contrasts. And no one can read Talbot's death scene (ll. 2318–2356) without feeling the effect of the contrasts that centre around such word-pairs as “Götter-Dummheit,” “Vernunft-Aberwitz,” “ernstes Lebengrobes Gaukelspiel,” “Kriegsruhm-Staub,” “lange Freundschaft-kurzer Abschied.” In short, we find Schiller's most poetic contrasts thus far in this romantic tragedy; just as we find in the Maid²² herself the greatest of contrasts as compared with the other characters. She was for Schiller the symbol of the poetic will.

ALLEN WILSON PORTERFIELD.

Barnard College.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON GATIEN DE COURTILZ, SIEUR DU VERGER

All readers of Dumas' *Trois Mousquetaires* know the name of at least one of Courtilz' novels, but little precise information concerning the author has been available. The biographical dictionaries and encyclopaedias, which uniformly follow Lelong and Nicéron, are full of inaccuracies and errors. Some interest in Courtilz has been shown recently, and it may be worth while to collect all available data. The man took such pains to conceal his identity that contemporaries were not sure of his name and knew little of his life. What is here added to their accounts comes from Jal's *Dictionnaire*

²² Cf. ll. 3189–3192, in which Johanna says:

Du siehst nur das Natürliche der Dinge,
Denn deinen Blick umhüllt das ird'sche Band.
Ich habe das Unsterbliche mit Augen
Gesehen.

Throughout the entire drama, it is not only a matter of allowing art to portray faithfully the Maid's character; it is also a question of elevating the other characters through her influence.

critique, Ravaisson's *Archives de la Bastille*, and from manuscripts preserved at Paris.¹

The family of Courtilz seems to have been originally of Liège.² The first known of the name was Conrad Walgrappe de Courtilz, mentioned in documents coming from the archives of Liège. He was present at the marriage of his son, Gérard, in 1373. The first who came to France was Hermand de Courtilz, who emigrated about 1455, and married Jeanne de Canny, of a noble Picard family. By various advantageous marriages the Courtilz rapidly gained wealth, and several large branches can be traced. Gatien declares himself, in the contract of his second marriage³ and in an inventory of his titles to nobility,⁴ son of Jean de Courtilz, seigneur de Tourly, and of Marie de Sandras. The estate of Tourly⁵ had come into the possession of the family toward the end of the fifteenth century by the marriage of one Jean de Courtilz with Isabeau de St. Pierre aux Champs. The mother of Gatien seems to have belonged to a family of Champagne.⁶ Several signatures of Gatien have been preserved. He wrote “Gatien de Courtilz,” to which he sometimes added “Seigneur de Sandras.” Hence the name by which he has generally been known. Nicéron says that the widow of Gatien (his third wife) could give no explanation of this title. It is likely that Marie de Sandras had brought some land in her dowry, and that her son, always eager for the insignia

¹ It is a pleasure to thank Professor C. H. Grandgent for kindly criticism of this article. A complete study of the life and writings of Courtilz is to appear shortly. A résumé, containing the relation of Courtilz to Lesage, has recently been published in the *Modern Language Review*, Vol. IX, pp. 475–492.

² The documents on which the following conclusions are founded will be quoted at length in my forthcoming study.

³ Cited by Jal.

⁴ Preserved at the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal.

⁵ The little village of Tourly (Oise, cant. de Chaumont, arr. de Beauvais), possesses a church and a château of the fourteenth century.

⁶ I have not found the name of Gatien or of his parents in the manuscript genealogies at the Bibl. Nat., but a careful study of all the evidence leads to the conclusion that he was descended from a younger son of the branch of the Courtilz who were lords of Tourly and other estates.

of nobility, assumed this title for lack of better. Why did he not call himself seigneur de Tourly? Among the documents regarding Gatien which are preserved in the Arsenal Library is an inventory of papers presented by him to prove his nobility. In them is mentioned an act dated the tenth of January, 1670, "par lequel M^{re} Gatien de Courtitz, chevalier, fils de M^{re} Jean de Courtitz, aussi ch^{er}, seigneur de Tourly, et de dame Marie de Sandras, renonce à la succession de son père, et s'en tient au douaire de la dame sa mère et au legs fait à son profit par dame Hélène de Billy, son aieule maternelle."⁷

Another item mentions a document "par lequel led^t Sr de Courtitz [i. e. Gatien], en qualité d'héritier de dame Marie de Sandras, sa mère, veuve de M^{re} Jean de Courtitz, chevalier, etc., vend à Guillaume Henné les héritages y mentionnés, moyennant 30 livres de rente." The document is lost and there is no identifying the *héritages*. In any case, Gatien had the title of *Seig^r de Sandras* in 1684, as is shown

⁷ There is at least one error here. Hélène de Billy, according to the same inventory, was the mother of the father of Gatien, hence his paternal grandmother. She had married a Jean de Courtitz (see d'Hozier, *Armorial général*, II, 240). But, according to the manuscript genealogies, Jean had only two sons, N. . . de Courtitz, seigneur de Tourly, who died without contracting marriage, and Jacques de Courtitz, seigneur de Tourly après son frère, also deceased unmarried. The only remaining child, a daughter named Louise, married one Louis de Clère, baron de Beaumetz, Dec. 22, 1615. There is no mention of the Jean, seigneur de Tourly, whom Gatien claims as his father. It seems more likely that he was the grandson of a Charles, mentioned as the brother of Jean and brother-in-law of Hélène. The descendants of younger members of the family are not named. Then, after the death of the sons of Hélène, the estate of Tourly passed in total or partial title to Jean, son of the aforesaid Charles and father of Gatien. After the death of this Jean, the estate returned to the older branch, descendants of Louise de Courtitz and Louis de Clère. This hypothesis is supported by the following mention in the inventory: "Transaction entre M^{re}. Louis de Clère, chevalier, seigr de Tourly, et ledit Sr Gatien de Courtitz, pardevant notaires à Paris, en date du 3 mars 1672 pour raison dudit legs." Gatien may well have claimed descent from Hélène de Billy as being the greatest dame of the family.

by Jal. In the contract of his third marriage, also cited by Jal, he writes, *Seig^r du Verger*. Documents at the Arsenal Library prove that he acquired this estate the 4th of June, 1689. The above-cited inventory seems to belong to a claim to exemption from taxes, as a noble, on this estate.⁸ I have given the foregoing evidence in detail in order to justify my supposition as to the correct name of our writer.

The date and place of birth of Gatien are doubtful. Sallengre says he was a native of Champagne, apparently because his mother was a Champenoise. Lelong, correcting Sallengre, says he was born at Montargis,⁹ and this statement, repeated by Nicéron, appears in a number of biographical dictionaries. But Lelong, in his essay on Courtitz, and Nicéron, correcting his earlier article, declare that he was born at Paris. Nicéron adds "rue de l'Université." A register of marriage contracts of the parish of St. Germain l'Auxerrois for the year 1640 proves that there was a family of Courtitz at Paris at this time. The date of the birth of Gatien is usually put at about 1644.

Nothing is known of the youth and education of Gatien. Lelong says he was a soldier¹⁰ and captain in the regiment of Champagne. The contract of his second marriage states that he was "capitaine dans le régiment de Beaupré" in 1678. Ravaisson, without citing his authority, says he was "d'abord mousquetaire, ensuite cornette dans le régiment Royal-Etranger, puis lieutenant et capitaine dans le régiment de Beaupré Choiseul, où il fut cassé."¹¹

⁸ For the coat of arms of Gatien see J. B. Rielstap, *Armorial général*, Gouda, 1887, 2 vols. in 8vo.

⁹ See the *Bibl. Hist.*, 1st ed., Paris, 1719, under No. 9745. This is changed in the revised edition. The earlier statement seems based on the fact that Le Verger is near Montargis.

¹⁰ This is confirmed by a police report drawn up during his imprisonment: "Il a été officier dans les troupes, depuis établi en Hollande en qualité d'auteur, etc." Ravaisson cites part of this document, *op. cit.*, X, p. 7. The complete text is in the *Bibl. Nat., Coll. Clair.*, no. 283, fol. 353.

¹¹ I have not been able to get any further evidence as to his military career. The archives of the war office have no record of him, and his name is not in the *Gazette*, nor in the *Chron. Hist. Mil.* of Pinard.

From the few existing documents some evidence can be gleaned regarding the movements of Gatien from 1682 until his arrest. He was at Paris in 1682, and signed a paper by which his wife bound herself to pay his debts. These seem to have been numerous enough to justify Bayle's assertion that his first pamphlets were pot-boilers. Lelong says he moved to Holland in 1683 to have these books printed. They were contraband goods which finally landed their author in the Bastille. He was at Paris the 23rd of March, 1684, and signed the certificate of baptism of his son at St. Sulpice.¹² In Holland, says Lelong, he was known under the name of de Montfort,¹³ and in fact, among the papers seized upon him at the time of his arrest is the record of transactions of a M. de Montfort with a M. Canto of Liège during the years 1688-89. Lelong adds that he thought proper to change his residence after the publication of the *Histoire de la guerre en Hollande* (1689), which had offended his hosts, and that he returned to Paris. From there we have a few letters¹⁴ written to his wife, who was at Le

Verger. In these letters he shows a warm affection for her, and a lively interest in the affairs of his provincial neighbors. In one he expresses his regret at the death of the village *curé*, and declares that he shall not feel at home with a new one. In another, much worried about his wife's health, he writes naïvely enough: "Mande-moi si tu es grosse absolument." It is good to recall such incidents, which throw a more sympathetic light on this licentious pamphleteer, who delights in describing with no little vivacity the amorous intrigues of the great.

There is good evidence that Gatien kept an interest in the army and that he recruited soldiers for his military friends. Among the Arsenal Library documents is a letter signed "de Courtilz Sandras" with a certificate of the death of one recruit and asking for five or six new ones.

More interesting is the proof that Gatien was active in aiding his associates, venders of contraband books, etc., to escape the consequences of their misdeeds. One of these fellows, Godard de Reims, was the cause of his imprisonment.¹⁵

On the 20th of April, 1693, he was incarcerated in the Bastille as a "faiseur de libelles dangereux, remplis d'injures atroces contre la France, le gouvernement et les ministres." And the report adds: "Doit être bien gardé." However, his wife secured permission to visit him frequently and in June, 1696, he obtained "la liberté de la cour." So, although Besmaus was charged to take care that the prisoner should not write or receive any papers other than family documents brought by his wife, and though his meeting with her was under the supervision of an officer, there is no reason to cancel from the list of his works a book which appeared during his imprisonment. He profited by this experience when describing the sufferings of some of his heroes in the Bastille, notably in the *Mémoires de M. de la Fontaine*

M. Funck-Brentano (*Cat. des Mss. de la Bibl. de l'Ars.*, T. IX, pp. 81-82), repeats the notice of Ravaissou, and adds that Courtilz was cashiered after the peace of Nimègue. There are in the works of Courtilz scattered references which may be cited for what they are worth. *L'Histoire de la guerre en Hollande* claims to be the work of an eye-witness who had fought through the whole war. In the *Mercure historique et politique* (T. V, p. 789), the writer claims to have been present at the death of Turenne, which is vividly described in the *Histoire* (Livre IV, p. 297). A "Sr de Courtilz, Lieutenant Colonel de Cavalerie, François de nation" in the service of Denmark, is mentioned in the *Mercure* (T. IV, p. 442). Again in the *Histoire* (Vol. I, pp. 335-336) a "Courtils (sic), capitaine de cavalerie," is named as in command of the rear-guard of the French army at *le Col de Bagnols* in Spain. The preface of *L'Histoire des promesses illusoires* states that the work is written by a Frenchman, who had been for some time in Cologne, vainly seeking advancement in the army which "S. A. Electorale veut mettre sur pied pour la défense de l'Empire." This work was published in 1684.

¹² Cited by Jal.

¹³ Sallengre calls him *Montfort de Courtilz*, and police records, cited by Ravaissou, call him *Montfort de Courtils* (sic).

¹⁴ Preserved at the Bibl. de l'Arsenal.

¹⁵ Ravaissou, *op. cit.*, X, p. 7, quotes a part of this document. Thus printed it has been misinterpreted. It is a police report on certain prisoners then at the Bastille (dated 13 octobre 1697). See *Coll. Clair.*, n. 283, fol. 353, at the Bibl. Nat.

(1698), whose history seems to have been based on that of a fellow-prisoner.¹⁶ One cannot help wondering whether the first idea of the *Mémoires de M. d'Artagnan* (the famous captain was a fellow-countryman and comrade of Besmaus in their early days) did not come from this contact with the superintendent of the Bastille, or from stories told about him by other prisoners. Gatien seems to have kept a grudge against Besmaus.

The *Archives* at Paris possess an anonymous letter¹⁷ addressed to d'Argenson. It is dated the 18th of January, 1699. The chief of police is directed to see Courtils (*sic*) and learn from him whether, if released, he has means to earn an honest living. The prisoner apparently gave satisfaction, for, six weeks later, on the 2nd of March, 1699, he was released. He received the order, however, to quit Paris and "de n'en approcher de sa vie de vingt lieues aux environs."

Deprived of Paris, Gatien was discontented, and three months later he obtained permission to return for three months to receive medical treatment. He managed to remain a longer time—the documents cited by Ravaisson indicate some connivance on the part of the police—and he soon drew upon himself the suspicion of the authorities. Police records, cited by Ravaisson, give an interesting picture of this period of his life. He seems to have plied his trade right under the nose of the officials. "Il a le secret de les [ses ouvrages imprimés en Hollande] faire entrer dans Paris comme il veut par des correspondances secrètes. Il en fait des débits extraordinaires; il les vend en blanc; il a un relieur attitré pour les relier," etc.

However, on the 12th of September, 1701, an anonymous letter from Rotterdam addressed to d'Argenson denounced the just published *Annales de la Cour et de Paris*,¹⁸ and on the 28th of December Pontchartrain wrote from

Versailles to d'Argenson: "Il ne faut pas différer d'arrêter du Rollet et Courtils (*sic*), s'ils se trouvent coupables, et les mettre à la B."¹⁹

No other documents have been discovered in regard to the second imprisonment, and nothing is known beyond Lelong's statement that he was imprisoned in 1702, and passed nine years in the Bastille. During the first three, adds Lelong, he was gaoled in a small cell.²⁰

Gatien de Courtilz married three times, if we may trust Jal. Nothing is known of his first wife. His second was Louise Pannetier, whom he married the 14th of March, 1678. Her father, according to Jal, was "Maistre Jacques Pannetier, secrétaire de M^e Ladvocat, maistre des requestes." He had stipulated that she should be "séparée de biens d'avec lui." I have referred to the document of 1682²¹ by which she bound herself to pay her husband's debts; the few letters preserved of Gatien's are addressed to her, and she is mentioned in the above-cited police reports. The date of her death is unknown. Immediately after his second exit from the Bastille, if we accept Lelong's dates, Gatien married, on the 4th of February, 1711, Marguerite Maurice, widow of the bookseller Amable Auroy.

He died the 8th of May, 1712, "rue du Hurepois," and was buried in the cemetery of St. André des Arcs the following day.²²

BENJAMIN M. WOODBRIDGE.

University of Texas.

¹⁶ Cited by Ravaisson, X, p. 407.

¹⁷ Ravaisson observes in a note: "Beuchot insinua dans la *Biographie universelle*, que cet ouvrage (*Les Annales*) avait fait mettre de Courtils (*sic*) à la Bastille. On voit que les *Annales* ont paru longtemps après la sortie du prisonnier." But it should be noticed that Beuchot is only repeating Lelong. Both refer to the second imprisonment, for they were ignorant of the first. Beuchot says, with Lelong and Nicéron, that Gatien returned to Holland in 1694.

¹⁸ See *Dossiers Bleus*, no. 218, fol. 395, at the Bibl. Nat.

¹⁹ Marriage contracts and date of death are taken from Jal.

²⁰ The reasons for this statement will be fully set forth in my complete study.

²¹ *Archives*, cote O¹ 43, fol. 29.

²² This letter, cited as anonymous by Ravaisson, was written by Bayle. See Hermann Runge, *Gatien de Courtilz de Sandras und die Anfänge des Mercure Historique et Politique*, Halle, 1887, pp. 20-21.

SPEKE, PARROT. AN INTERPRETATION OF SKELTON'S SATIRE

Certain poems, though familiar to the students of English, are yet nearly devoid of meaning. Chief in this unenviable class must be placed Skelton's *Speke, Parrot*. The "incomparable" Dyce calls it a "very obscure production." Of recent commentators Brie scarcely touches it; and Koelbing characterizes it as¹ "preserved in a greatly mutilated condition, it is the most incoherent of all his poems, and, in parts, absolutely unintelligible"—an opinion after a previous careful analysis.² For this criticism there are three excellent reasons. The earliest edition we have dates from the mid-century, and the composition is undated. Therefore we have no external guide to the time of the allusions. The sole indication is that in the list of works given in the *Garland of Laurel* (printed 1523) is mentioned

Item the Popingay, that hath in commendacyoun
Ladyes and gentylwomen suche as deseruyd,
And suche as be counterfettis they be reseruyd.

And the poem *Speke, Parrot*, whatever may be the interpretation, has nothing to do with ladies and gentlewomen! Consequently it may have been written at any time between 1490 and 1529, when he died. It is unnecessary to remark how much this complicates the problem. Political satire is forceful as an acute criticism of events already known to the reader. And without dating how can we know the events? Imagine the fog that would inclose *Absolom and Achitophel*, if we knew only that it had been written between 1660 and 1700 and might apply to any circumstance in the reigns of Charles II, James II, or William and Mary. A certain measure of possible obscurity is, therefore, inherent in the type.

For the other reason, however, the poetic conceptions of the age are responsible. The avowed aim of the poet was to write so that

there were two quite distinct meanings, the obvious and the hidden allegorical meaning. Thus Hawes³ commends the ancient poets because

They were so wyse and so inventife
Theyr obscure reason, fayre and sugratife,
Pronounced trouthe under cloudy figures,
By the inventoryn of theyr fatall scriptures.

And Skelton in the *Bowge of Courte* feels doubtful as to his ability to use sufficiently "couerte termes." In this type of work the pleasure of reading a poem was doubled with that arising from guessing a riddle. Obscurity was prized for its own sake. Wilson (1560) summarizes the condition as follows: "The mysticall wiseman and Poeticall Clerkes, will speake nothing but quaint Proverbs, and blinde allegories, delighting much in their owne Darkenesse, especially, when none can tell what they doe say." In the particular poem in question Skelton may also have not desired to be too plain for political reasons. In any case he amuses himself, if not the reader, by putting all possible hurdles before his meaning. The poem purports to be a dialogue between a parrot and its mistress. But as a parrot is not logical, this device enables him to bring in any amount of casual gibberish, to break the connection whenever he chooses, to employ tags of Latin, or any language, to change allusions, etc. And when the abused reader objects, Skelton grins the reply that it is only parroting.

The third and last reason is that apparently it was composed at different dates. Consequently the poem *Speke, Parrot* is not one poem, but several. These are indicated by definite breaks, sometimes even by apparent dating. Thus after the *Lenuoy primere* comes "Penultimo die Octobris, 33°"; after the *Secunde Lenuoy*, "In diebus Novembris, 34," etc. The apparent conclusion is that between the first and second Envoy a year has elapsed. The result is inevitable confusion.

On the other hand, the poem has a definite

¹ Arthur Koelbing, *Cambridge Hist. of Eng. Lit.*, iii, 85.

² *Zur Charakteristik John Skelton's*, 123-127.

³ Hawes, *Pastime of Pleasure*, Percy Society, Chap. VIII.

hidden meaning. We are told (l. 207) that metaphor and allegory are the protection of the Parrot; that while ignorant fools may not see the meaning (ll. 298-9),

For whoo lokythe wyselye in your warkys may fynde
Muche frutefull mater . . .

that (l. 319) those who cannot see it, have small intelligence; and that (ll. 363-5)

For trowthe in parabyll ye wantonlye pronounce,
Langagys diuers, yet undyr that dothe reste
Maters more precious then the ryche iacounce. .

This continued iteration upon the hidden meaning implies not only that many at the time found it difficult, but also that there is a definite meaning to be found.

It seems to the present writer that the assumption that the text is greatly mutilated is unnecessary. At least a possible interpretation may be given for the mass of the poem. The first question is that of the date. This is, I think, indicated by the figures given after the months. Dyce's note to l. 280 reads: "With respect to the dates . . . if '33' and '34' stand for 1533 and 1534 (when both Skelton and the Cardinal were dead), they must have been added by the transcriber; and yet in the volume from which these portions of *Speke, Parrot* are now printed (ms. Harl. 2252) we find, only a few pages before, the name of 'John Colyn mercer of London,' with the date '1517.'" The explanation of these figures is both obvious and unusual. Skelton, who was a Lancastrian and had been connected with the court of Henry VII, during his tutorship to the young Prince Henry must have dated his formal papers from the accession of that king. For sentimental reasons, or from a desire to be half intelligible, he continued to do so during the new reign of Henry VIII. This is of course without precedent and was probably a guide only for himself. As Henry VII began his reign on Bosworth Field, Aug. 22nd, 1485, "October 33^o" and "November, 34" are translated into October, 1517, and November, 1518. If this be true, the various portions of *Speke, Parrot* form a running commentary upon the events of those two years.

To explain the situation it is necessary to go back a few years. From the Middle Ages Tudor England had inherited two different systems of courts: (a) the Convocation of the bishops and the ecclesiastical courts which claimed jurisdiction over all members of the clergy, and (b) Parliament and the state courts which claimed jurisdiction over the rest of the nation. That there should be conflict between these two systems to the modern mind seems almost inevitable, particularly as the ecclesiastical courts claimed the "benefit of the clergy" and the right of "sanctuary." That there was such conflict is shown by the fact that in 1513 Parliament decreed that the right of sanctuary should be denied to murderers and robbers. In 1515, Robert Kederminster, Abbot of Winchcombe, preached at St. Paul's Cross a sermon in which he denounced this act. As three members of the clergy had been accused of murder by a jury of London citizens, this sermon was regarded as a gauntlet of defiance thrown down by the Church. Henry Standish of the Grey Friars replied, asserting the superior right of the King's prerogative. The Convocation supported Kederminster and the Parliament Standish. Whereupon the King, upon the advice of Dr. Voysey, his chaplain, heard the case, and naturally decided in favor of the State. "I will never consent to your desire, any more than my progenitors have done."⁴ Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Fox, Bishop of Winchester, apparently felt strongly that the right of the Church had been impinged upon. Standish and Voysey were regarded as having betrayed the Church by the church party, and equally by their opponents as having defended the rights of the people. The result was that the clergy were disliked in London. Wolsey's attitude was apparently trimming; he argued for the Church at the same time protesting his attachment to the Crown. Then, toward the end of the same year, both Warham and Fox withdrew from active participation in the government, the one resigning the great seal and the other the privy seal, and Wolsey and Ruthal,

⁴Keilwey's report of the argument, quoted by Gairdner, *Church Hist.*, p. 47.

Bishop of Durham, took the places made vacant by them. By the City Standish was regarded as a hero. Consequently he was urged to defend them also from the foreigners who, they believed, were absorbing English business. John Lincoln, a broker, appealed to him. Upon his wise refusal, however, a Dr. Beale preached an incendiary sermon on the general thought of England for Englishmen. On this followed, 1517, the celebrated riot called "Evil May Day." The City rose in rebellion, which was put down by calling in the troops. Lincoln himself was hanged, with some others, but the majority were pardoned. Such is a very brief outline of events presupposed to be known to the reader.

The poem purports to be the rambling ejaculations of a parrot, with occasional reminders that more is intended than is obvious, and that the explanation is to be found in the use of metaphor and allegory (ll. 208-9). The parrot was created by God (l. 217), and is incorruptible (l. 218); it then represents the Church. As such it has the Pentecostal gift of tongues. But Skelton identifies the Church with his own particular party. The parrot consequently favors neither the new element of Wolsey nor the popular variety of Standish. It is the old conservative Church of Warham and Fox—a fact that would partly explain Barclay's possible enmity. That Church has fallen upon evil days. The suggestion for this curious personification may be due to the fact that a "popinjay" was affixed to a pole as a target for archery practice. And the present parrot has been instructed by Melpomene (l. 213). As by the latest possible date given for his birth Skelton, in 1517, must have been past middle age, the Parrot is conservative. It preaches discretion (l. 53) and cites biblical examples of patience under trials, Abraham, Job, etc. It is loyal to "King Henry the VIII, our royal king" (l. 36) and to "Kateryne incomparable" (l. 38). So with the gibbet of Baldock made for Jack Leg (John Lincoln?) (l. 75) in mind, of all things beware of riot (l. 103). In that Parrot is on the side of the King (l. 112) and "hath no favor to Esebon" (London) (l. 113). For the leaders of Israel (Warham and Fox) have abandoned

it, and Seon, the regent Amorraeorum (Standish of the Grey Friars) and Og (Voysey or Beale) have taken possession (ll. 115-126). Now the right of sanctuary "standyth in lyttlylsted" (ll. 127-8). The real traitor is not the preacher (Beale or Standish) but he that advised the King (Voysey) (ll. 132-135). This ends the first part.

The second section takes up the discussion of Greek. Here again Skelton is conservative. He does not object to Greek (l. 146),

For aurea lingua Graeca ought to be magnyfyed,

but to the fact that it is not practical (ll. 150-153). Yet with this limited knowledge they

scrape out good scrypture, and set in a gall,
Ye go about to amende, and ye mar all. (ll. 158-9.)

This seems like a reference to Erasmus's *New Testament*. The result of it all is that the clergy neglect their Latin that is necessary and fail to acquire Greek that at best is merely an adornment.

The third section consists of a curious love lyric. Galathea, a lady who appears for the first time, invites the parrot to tell the moan Pamphylus made for his mate. The allusion is to a medieval poem *De arte amandi*. The meaning apparently is that the clergy should return to Latin, that spurious Greek is worthless, and that amen with a *d* should be the order of the day.

The fourth section (ll. 280-300), *Lenuoy primere*, ends with the phrase "Penultimo die Octobris, 33°." If the present theory be correct, it is dated definitely October 30th, 1517. The book called the "Popagay" is told to persuade Jerebesethe "home to resorte" because Tytus is now at Dover, the *tonsan de Jason* is in the shrouds of the vessels, and Lyacon of Lybyk and Lydy has his prey. This obviously has no apparent connection with what has preceded. It must deal with some foreign policy. The sequence of thought,—if such a term may be used in treating a poem whose chief characteristic is lack of consecutiveness—seems to be that not only are the troubles of the Church due to diffusion of energy and a

questioning spirit on account of the study of Greek, but also to the new heads of the Church, Wolsey with the great seal and Ruthal with the privy seal are too much concerned with other than churchly affairs. In this connection two facts should be remembered. First, that as shown by the notes appended to the poems against Garnessche during these years Skelton was in relations with the Court.⁵ Secondly that Lord Thomas Howard, Earl of Surrey, who in 1524 became Duke of Norfolk, was the strenuous opponent of Wolsey's policy.⁶ He was a patron of Skelton, at his house, Sheriff-Hutton, the *Garland of Laurel* was written, and his son, the poet Surrey, was Skelton's pupil. It is not surprising, therefore, to find Skelton unsympathetic with the foreign policy of Wolsey. The key to the interpretation of the passage is given by the line,

For Tytus at Dover abydythe in the rode.

The passage will be clearer if certain historical facts are borne in mind. Almost the sole result of Henry's invasion of France in 1513 had been the capture of Tournay. But the perfidy of Maximilian in the Treaty of Noyon caused a *rapprochement* between France and England. Rumors of an agreement between the two powers were imminent. "At Henry's wish the French commissioners crossed over to England in October,"⁷ and by November 11th they had reached London. They came to purchase Tournay for 400,000 crowns. The *tonsan de Jason* is explained. Lyacon is of course Lycaon, as Dyce suggests. Lycaon, in the *Third Metamorphosis* of Ovid, by his impiety toward Jupiter, is the immediate cause of the deluge. That this was in Skelton's mind is shown by the fact that the last line of each of the last ten stanzas of the poem begins with the phrase "Syns Dewcalyon's flode." The contrast between Juppiter, Henry VIII, and the over-

proud subject, Wolsey, is given in ll. 399-404:

Jupiter ut nitido deus est veneratus Olympo;
Hic coliturque deus.
Sunt data thura Jovi, rutilo solio residenti;
Cum Jovi thura capit.
Jupiter astrorum rector dominusque polorum;
Anglica sceptrum regit.

Nor does he omit the pun on *λυκάων*, wolf; (l. 428)

Hys woluy's hede, wanne, bloo as lede, gapythe ouer
the crowne.

The phrase "of Lybia and Lydia" (Jeremiah 46, 9) suggests that Wolsey has not yet despoiled the Egyptians. Jereboseth probably refers to Wingfield then holding Calais. He was appointed commissioner to sit at Calais to adjudicate the disputes between the English and the French merchants,⁸

For replicacion restles that he of late ther made
(l. 284)

all of which was now rendered unnecessary. The lines, 282-3,

For the cliffes of Scaloppe they rore wellaway,
And the sandes of Cefas begyn to waste and fade

allude first to the passage of the Channel. The names are taken from the Greek *σκάλοψ*, a mole, and *κηφήν*, a drone-bee, perhaps with a side hit at the policy of Wolsey and of Francis.

The fifth section, *Secunde Lenuoy*, according to this reckoning is dated "In diebus Novembris, 1518." The parrot is to be sent over the salt foam to urge "ower soleyne seigneour Sadoke," to come home. Though he has not the great seal, as president and regent he rules everything. Dyce's note on this passage reads: "In applying the name of Sadoke to Wolsey, Skelton alludes to the high-priest of Scripture, not to the knight of the Round Table." This is followed by Koelbing:⁹ "Im zweiten (en-

⁵ Brie, "Skelton-Studien," *Englische Studien*, XXXVII, 59.

⁶ *Dictionary of National Biography*, article by the late Mandel Creighton, Bishop of London.

⁷ Brewer, *Reign of Henry VIII*, i, 189.

⁸ I. S. Leadam, *Dictionary of National Biography*, article *Wingfield*.

⁹ Arthur Koelbing, *Zur Charakteristik John Skelton's*, p. 125.

voy) wird der Kardinal als *soleyne seigneur Sadoke* (l. 304) verspottet, der Dinge unternehme, die eben unausführbar seien." The first obvious objection to this attribution is in the lines 309-10,

With porpose and graundepose he may fede hym
fatte,
Thowghe he pampyr not hys paunche with the
grete seali.

This can scarcely refer to Wolsey as he had the great seal! Actually it is again a question of the French alliance. Charles Somerset, Earl of Worcester, had been largely instrumental in negotiating it,¹⁰ and in November, 1518, had the reward. He headed the elaborate embassy sent to the French court. The name, taken from the Tenth Book of the *Morte D'Arthur*, is applied because just as Sadoke was a friend to the young Alisander, so Somerset was enough older than Henry to guide him. It is he, presumably, that is the *Sydrake* of the sixth section, in which it is prophesied that he will lose all his effort. Sidrach is the guide, philosopher and friend to the King Bochus in the medieval romance. This section is dated the fifteenth of December, actually only three days later than the formal reception of the embassy at the French court.

The seventh and eighth sections are both very short, with much abused Latin, and are both a rather vague attack upon Wolsey. This brings us to the last section where the attack is clearly upon the conditions of the times and upon Wolsey as author of those conditions. As these accusations are much the same as those repeated later in *Why Come Ye Not to Court* they need here no comment or illustration.¹¹ Only one line presents any real difficulty, line 425,

Of Pope Julius cardys he ys chefe dardynall.

The explanation adopted by Koelbing is that the reference is to Clement VII whose first

name before the pontificate was Giulio. Aside from any question of date it seems improbable that an Englishman would mention the Pope in so unnecessarily familiar a manner, or be understood if he did. On the other hand, Julius II, *il Papa Terribile*, had left such a reputation for intrigue, that here his name is used for condemnation. If this interpretation be correct, there is no reason for dating the poem later than 1518.

It is quite obvious that this article cannot aim to be an annotated edition of *Speke, Parrot*. Many of the locutions are vague and many of the references unexplained. Some of them probably never can be, since so detailed a history of the two years as is required has not come down to us. Nor can we be certain that we have guessed the motive for the choice of the names. For example, the only reason for his calling the French commissioners "Tytus" that I know is that Titus Tatius, the king of the Sabines, was the neighbor to Rome. And that seems very far-fetched! Partly, also, this obscurity was due to the deliberate intention of the poet. As yet, and while still connected with the Court, he did not dare to be more plain. Also, I think, he took a certain amount of amusement in veiling his meaning. That the present interpretation in general is correct is shown by the fact that it applies in so many particulars. The previous difficulty in arriving at a solution was due to the tendency to read Wolsey into all the varying passages. And in some places, such as those dealing with Somerset, where the attack applies equally to any leader of any group, it was very plausible. The difficulty is that it explained only in spots. The interest of the present solution is that it shows Skelton, not as a reformer, and not as a radical, but a *laudator temporis acti*. And this is the Skelton chosen to educate a prince of the blood royal and the heir of the house of Howard. Perhaps from this point of view so detailed an analysis as this may not be lacking in interest.

JOHN M. BERDAN.

Yale University.

¹⁰ Brewer, *op. cit.*, 189.

¹¹ "The Dating of Skelton's Satires," *Pub. of the Mod. Lang. Association of America*, XXIX, 499 f.

Le Roman de Renard, par LUCIEN FOULET.
Paris, Champion, 1914. 574 pp. (*Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études, fascicule*
211.)

I

In a remarkable review¹ of Léopold Sudre's *Sources du roman de Renart*, written over twenty years ago, Gaston Paris said: "Il [M. Sudre] a écrit tout son livre sous l'inspiration d'une idée constamment suivie. . . . Cette idée . . . c'est que les récits du Roman de Renard ont pour base principale des 'contes d'animaux' empruntés au folk-lore et arrivés aux poètes français par transmission orale, et non des fables proprement dites gréco-orientales, *puv z a qred anel issne tuerb l p-sellæ anb uæq* as was so often the case with the great scholar, while recognizing the essential truth, as it seemed to him, of the thesis so ably maintained, he also saw its limitations. More than one of these he himself undertook to correct. For instance, he realized clearly that Branch I—the *Plaid de Renard*—was too obviously a satire of mediaeval society to be hastily judged a reflection of the folk-mind, above all it was too artistically composed, and he gently remonstrated with M. Sudre by saying:² "le poète . . . a, cette fois, véritablement 'trouvé' et son œuvre a mérité, comme le dit M. Martin, de 'passer dans le fonds commun des poésies classiques.'" It would be interesting to know what Paris would have thought of this new study of the animal epic. For, it may be said at once, the result of M. Foulet's work is to see white where M. Sudre saw black and to give us a *Renard* which, instead of being an agglomerate of folk-tales, composed by no one in particular and having as even G. Paris thought "no sources in the real sense of the word," is in the main the product of one or two men of genius drawing freely on Latin mediaeval literature, and possibly on Marie de France and

some of her contemporaries. In short, to quote Foulet himself:³ "influence littéraire, art conscient d'un but et d'une méthode, voilà ce qui sans cesse nous a apparus. Partout où on a tenté de rendre raison de l'œuvre de nos trouvères par un obscur travail préliminaire, dont ils n'auraient fait qu'enregistrer docilement les résultats, il nous a semblé qu'on avait fait fausse route." Extreme as this view seems at first blush, it is in line with the results arrived at latterly in the domain of the national epic and of lyric song. One needs but to recall the epoch-making studies of Bédier in his *Légendes épiques*. Foulet's study is dedicated to Bédier, and the premise upon which it rests is also Bédier's; namely, that the poems of the twelfth century must be considered primarily as the products of the twelfth century, and not with the *a priori* assumption that they are the last links in a chain, the first links of which have thus far passed unnoticed. As in all such reactions from an established point of view, there will doubtless be much in Foulet's work which further study will modify and correct, but his main thesis seems none the less sound and secure. The proofs of this abound in his extremely well-ordered and well-written treatise. Since Bédier's *Légendes épiques* there has not been a more important contribution to the history of Old French literature.

The book has twenty-one chapters and a "conclusion." The first chapter, entitled *théories actuelles*, deals with the present status of the problem. The beast-epic of Reynard the Fox survives in three well-known poetic forms: the Old French *Renart* (Foulet follows G. Paris in using *Renard*), the earliest branches of which probably go back to 1175, the *Ysen-grimus* of maître Nivard of Ghent, a Latin poem of about 1152, and the M. H. G. work by Heinrich der Glichezære of 1180, known as *Reinhart Fuchs*. Under the influence of Jacob Grimm, whose theory it was that the animal tale originates and survives among the folk at almost any epoch, scholars have been loath to attribute to these written documents any first-

¹ *Journal des Savants*, 1895. I quote from the *extraits*, Paris, 1895, 72 pp.

² P. 3.

³ P. 6.

⁴ P. 536.

hand value. And yet the prologue to Branch II of the *Renard* says⁵ distinctly:

Seigneurs, oï avez maint conte
 Mais onques n'oïstes la guerre,
 Qui tant fu dure de grant fin,
 Entre Renart et Ysengrin.

which is curious, to say the least, if a folk-tale to this effect was widely current in the twelfth century, but which is intelligible if we assume that the poet composed his work on the basis of written sources not accessible to the crowd. Even G. Paris, who was most prone to admit originality where it could be found, resolutely clung to the view of Sudre that the *Renard* is to be explained in the main as a product of the folk-mind, and that the extant written documents did not interact on one another but are themselves survivals of early folkloristic forms. Thus it is not strange to find Voretzsch in 1895 reject the strictures on Sudre's work made by Paris, and return almost *in toto* to the folk theory of Grimm. Witness what he says in the second edition of the *Einführung*⁶ under the date of 1913: "Der um 1150-51 . . . verfasste lat. *Ysengrimus* vereinigt geistlich-gelehrte dichtung mit echt volksthümlicher tradition: aus dieser stammt der grösste theil der stoffe wie die hier zum erstenmal be-
 gegnende individualisierung der tiere durch namen. . . . Nicht viel jünger als dieses werden die ältesten französischen fuchsdichtungen gewesen sein, die augenscheinlich vom *Ysengrimus* unabhängig waren, aber nur in jüngeren bearbeitungen fortleben." In other words, to quote Foulet:⁷ "Nous pourrions supprimer par la pensée tout ce qui, entre 1150 et 1250, a été écrit en dehors du *Roman de Renart* que nous n'obligerions pas MM. Sudre et Voretzsch à changer un iota à leurs théories." This, then, gives Foulet his point of departure: to investigate the actual extant branches of the *Renard*, their possible relation to the other written documents, notably Nivard's *Ysengri-*

mus and the clerical fable literature of the Middle Ages, and finally the authorship of the branches.

The second chapter takes up the archetype of the mss. in which the branches occur. There are over twenty such mss., which are far from agreeing in either the number or the order of the branches represented. Martin, who edited⁸ the entire poem—or poems—of 30,000 lines, on the whole followed ms. 20043 of the Bibliothèque Nationale, but attempted no rigorous classification. This has since been done by Büttner, a pupil of Martin's. Büttner⁹ saw that they fall into two general groups: A and B respectively. In A, branch I is separated from branch Va by III (VI), IV and V; whereas in B the last two verses of II are omitted, and Va follows at once after II. It is obvious, however, from a glance at the text, that, although B represents the more logical sequence, which is thus important for the chronology of the various tales, the order of A is closer to the archetype. This, as Foulet shows, comprised 16 branches out of a total of 27, and is at best a heterogeneous collection made by someone who was anxious to give the beast epic cyclic form, much as in a part of the Grail-Lancelot cycle¹⁰—to quote an analogy Foulet does not mention—the various "branches" originated in response to a similar attempt, and as in the national epic the various *gestes* or families came into being. In any case, the archetype cannot be considered as the original ms. of any one tale, and the road is thus open to consider the respective branches in their logical relationship. It is to be hoped that some day Foulet will re-edit the *Renard* according to the latter principle.

The most important of the various tales is undoubtedly branch II. Here the enmity between the fox and the wolf is explained, and this is the main issue of the beast epic. But is branch II necessarily the earliest? And if so, is it an original version or a reworking (*un*

⁵ Ed. Martin, p. 91.

⁶ P. 402.

⁷ P. 17.

⁸ Strasbourg-Paris, 1882.

⁹ *Die Ueberlieferung des Roman de Renard*, etc., Strassburg, 1891.

¹⁰ The *Perlesvaus*.

remaniement)? To these two questions Foulet devotes the next three chapters.

Sixteen branches¹¹ are obviously earlier than the rest—on this all scholars are agreed. Of the sixteen, only two do not refer to preceding branches. These are branches II and III. These two again differ in that branch III starts *in medias res*, whereas II, which like III is one of the longest branches, is preceded by a prologue of some 1396 vv. Here the author (or *remanieur*) cites such works as the *Roman de Troie*, the lost *Tristan* by La Chèvre, and refers in general to the chansons de geste and fabliaux; then follow the above-quoted verses on the newness of his theme.¹² It is evident thus that his poem was written subsequently to the works mentioned, or approximately in 1175–1177, if, as Foulet argues, La Chèvre's *Tristan* was composed a short time after that of Thomas.¹³ But what may be the *terminus ad quem* of the entire group of sixteen branches? To this question branch XVII alone can give us the answer, for XVII is possible only after the preceding fifteen branches. It consists of the so-called *processio* or would-be burial of Renard. That is, Renard feigning death is carried forth in funeral procession by the entire court of Noble, the lion. Before the conclusion of the ceremony, however, the fox is in full flight to the amazement and terror of the whole company. The branch was popular, as is attested by the number of its mss. and by the references to its theme in mediaeval literature and art. Fortunately, a passage from Odo of Sheriton¹⁴ enables Foulet to clench the matter. In one of his sermons (ab. 1219) Odo remarks: *Cum dives moritur, tunc processio bestiarum, que [sic] in parietibus depingitur figuraliter, adimpletur*. If Odo, writing in 1219, could refer to the scene of the *processio* as "painted on the walls" of some château, it is obvious that the poem in which this event was first narrated was composed before that

date. Hence the *Roman de Renard*, at least the sixteen branches in question, was written between 1175 and 1219, provided always that the *processio* was not known (as of course the folklorists would affirm it was) from some earlier French source.¹⁵

The idea that the *Renard* cannot be an original is largely an inheritance of the Romantic past. To the Grimms, of course, most mediaeval literature is the detritus of earlier, more perfect works that have not survived. In the case of the *Renard*, the erroneous notion has obtained that the date of the mss. is approximately the date of the cycle—an idea first expressed by Legrand d'Aussy in the year VII of the First Republic, and still current to-day; as though we should argue that Crestien de Troyes is an author of the thirteenth century because the mss. of his works are all later than 1200. But there are two pieces of external evidence which have been adduced as definite proof of a pre-existing lost version, written, according to Paris, or oral, according to Voretzsch.

These are: (a) a passage from Guibert de Nogent stating that in 1112 the bishop of Laon, a certain Galdricus, on the point of being murdered called his assassin 'Ysengrimus'; and (b) the fact that the fabliau *Richeut*, dated about 1159,¹⁶ bears the name which in a certain part of our cycle is given to Renard's wife. As regards (b), Foulet shows readily that the date of the *Richeut* may just as well be 1188; that is, after the appearance of branch II, and that since the name *Richeut* occurs only in ms. B of our cycle, and then in one of the late branches, namely XXIV, no inference can be drawn from it as to the other branches. As for (a), upon close examination the rather involved passage in Nogent resolves itself into

¹⁵ On the chronology of the other branches of the group, see Ch. VI.

¹⁶ See Suchier and Birch-Hirschfeld, *Geschichte der franz. Litteratur*,² 1913, p. 197. The date depends on the statement: *Tolose Que li rois Henris tant golose*. Foulet (pp. 92 ff.) shows that this was still true in 1188. Lecompte, ed. *Richeut* in the *Romanic Review* IV, 262, gives the earlier date, though he observes, in agreement with Ebeling, that *Richeut* as the name of the Fox's wife is peculiar to branch XXIV.

¹¹ See p. 31, note, branch xvii is the last in the group.

¹² Cf. Martin, *l. c.*

¹³ See pp. 40 ff., 219 ff.

¹⁴ Hervieux, *Les fabulistes latins*, IV, 319; cf. Foulet, p. 103.

the remark: "Solebat autem episcopus eum (the assassin) Isengrinum irridendo vocare, propter lupinam scilicet speciem: sic enim aliqui solent appellare lupos." And interesting as this reference is, it would hardly justify us in assuming with Paris¹⁷ that the names of "les principaux héros" of our epic were known at the beginning of the twelfth century. What it does prove is that some people, and they according to Foulet were clerks, called the wolf Ysengrimus as early as 1112, and further inferences Foulet would hesitate to make. So that here again we are thrown back on the testimony of the extant texts for a consideration of the source of our work.

Turning now to the main problem, so long deferred, Foulet finds this source largely in the Latin text of 1152. He establishes this fact by a comparison of the episodes of branch II and the parallel arrangement in book IV of the *Ysengrimus*. The prologue to branch II, we remember, mentions the chansons de geste, the fabliaux, the *Troie* and the *Tristan*. Thus its author would be an adept in the technique of narrative composition, the adaptation through elaboration of the materials of clerical Latin literature. That these lay in the domain of the fable, or rather animal tale, would not affect the question adversely. The climax of branch II is the rape of Hersent, wife of Ysengrin, by maître Renard himself. The branch begins with an account of how Renard successively but unsuccessfully tries his wiles on Chantecler, the cock, the titmouse or "mésange"—who has no *nomen proprium*—and Tibert, the cat. In each case he goes off hungry, largely through his own stupidity. Now, however, he encounters Tiécelin, the crow, and in an adventure which we all know he swindles the crow out of a savory, yellow cheese. Thus assuaged, he happens upon the lair of the wolf during Ysengrin's absence. Hersent, the wolf's wife, does the honors in true *courtois*

style, to such an extent that Renard profits by the occasion to betray Ysengrin in her ladyship's embraces. He also insults the brood of young wolves, indignant at his action. When Ysengrin returns, Hersent of course denies everything and even promises to bring Renard to justice. But—and this is the sixth and last episode of the branch—Hersent is no match for the wily fox, who this time profits by an *impasse* in which she is caught to violate her before the eyes of her belated husband. The branch closes with Ysengrin desiring but unable to obtain vengeance.

With the exception of certain differences of detail (Nivard omits episodes 3 and 4—and the piquant circumstance that lady Hersent is a party to the crime) the narrative is that of the Latin text. "L'auteur de la branche II," says¹⁸ Foulet, "a trouvé plus naturel que Renard ne cherche pas à tenter une seconde fois un coq qui a toutes les raisons du monde de se défier de lui, et c'est pourquoi, passant de Chantecler à la mésange, la narration doit recommencer sur nouveaux frais. Mais sur le point le plus important, le latin et le français s'accordent curieusement à grouper des récits qui ne semblent pas s'appeler ou se compléter." But the same series—if we omit episode 5—occurs in Marie de France; that is, *De vulpe et gallo*, *De vulpe et columba* and *De vulpe et ursa*, where to be sure the bear's wife and not the wolf's is the outraged lady. So that Sudre, who knows the latter episode (with the substitution of the bear's wife) also from modern folklore, argues that Marie, Nivard and Renard all came from the same source. On the face of it, however, such a conclusion is false: Marie lacks episode 5 on which so much depends in the other two versions, she knows nothing of the names of Ysengrin and Renard, and her tale of the fox and the wolf's wife contains the same *motif* but not the same plot as the other two versions. Since the problem then is whether Nivard and our romance represent parallel or derivative versions, the answer can only be that the *Renard* is here based on the *Ysengrimus*. As for the remainder of branch

¹⁷ In the *Mélanges de litt. fr.* 361; see also *Esquisse* (1907), p. 79. The text given by Grimm also mentions a *Renulfus*, interpreted by scholars as *Renardus*. Hence Paris' error. Novati first showed that the reading is *revulsus*, which Foulet corroborates. For bibliography, see Foulet, pp. 78 ff.

¹⁸ P. 125.

II, Foulet may be right in arguing, as he does in great detail, that the episode with Tibert is an invention of our author's, and that since Marie's version of episode 4 (the crow and the wolf) agrees with our text: 1, in motivating the theft of the cheese, 2, in not mentioning the beauty of the crow, 3, in leaving the last word to the fox, as against Phaedrus and the mediaeval Romulus collections, hence our author also drew on Marie,¹⁹—this conclusion is secondary to the main issue and should not be allowed to obscure it. For the important thing is that having once established the literary provenience of branch II, the other branches of the cycle take their places accordingly, as gradual additions—one is tempted to say 'accretions'—to the central episode of the story.

Thus Va is the natural continuation of II. The insult to Hersent cries for a settlement, and the well-known scene at Noble's court, where the animals with their amusing pseudonyms gather about the lion, like the knights about King Arthur, is a move in that direction. The redactor of ms. group B was correct in placing Va next to II: the two branches once constituted an entity and are, as language and style show, certainly by the same author. One of Foulet's most convincing chapters (X) is devoted to the latter's method of composition. We see there how under the influence of the epic and more especially of the *roman courtois*, together with a knowledge of legal procedure equal to that shown in the *Coutumes de Beauvoisis*, the trouvère transformed the clerical satiric episodes of Nivard into the more comprehensive beast epic, full of *bonhomie* and *verve*, a true reflection of mediaeval baronial society, destined to live on into modern times, long after its prototype the *Ysengrimus* was forgotten.

The rest of Foulet's treatise is devoted to the incidents of this growth. The various branches are considered with reference to their chronology and possible sources; the author-

ship of branches II and Va is considered, the relationship of the *Reinhart Fuchs* to our cycle is given a plausible explanation, and finally there is a chapter on the *Renard* and "folklore," in which the thesis is defended that "all of the passages from works of the thirteenth century in which scholars have sought to find echoes of contemporary folklore hail directly or indirectly from our widely-known romance."

A consideration of these problems will be taken up in the following number of this journal.

WM. A. NITZE.

University of Chicago.

FREDERICK S. BOAS, *University Drama in the Tudor Age*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1914.

Dr. Boas's book has been long awaited. First compiled in the form of a series of Clark Lectures, delivered at Cambridge in 1904-05, it was definitely announced as 'in preparation for publication in enlarged form' at the head of the bibliography of *University Plays* contributed by its author to the sixth volume of the *Cambridge History of English Literature* (1910). Let it be said at once that, in its characteristic excellence of style and judgment, in accuracy of detail, and in format, the volume can hardly fail to satisfy the expectations of the many students who for a decade have been looking to its publication.

There is, however, an important difference between the scope of the book as it now appears and that suggested in the earlier announcements that is likely to cause chagrin to Americans and other readers far removed from the English libraries, in which alone the majority of the academic Latin plays of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are accessible. The original title, *The English Academic Drama*, seemed to promise a comprehensive treatment of the entire extant output of the English scholastic stage till at least the period of the closing of the theatres in 1642; and Dr. Boas's summary of *University Plays* in Chapter XII of the sixth volume of the *Cambridge*

¹⁹ This has also been argued for episode 1, see for latest and most elaborate discussion, E. P. Dargan, *Cock and Fox*, in *MP* IV (1906), 57 ff. The fable occurs several times in the figures surrounding the Bayeux tapestry.

History, though restricting itself to plays acted at Oxford or Cambridge, did cover both the Tudor and the early Stuart age. It is therefore a disappointment to find that both in its actual practice and by its new title his definitive work refuses to treat any dramas not known to have been acted at one of the two universities before 1603. The particular reasons for this narrowing of range Dr. Boas does not explain, contenting himself with the categorical statement in his Preface: "I have dealt only with plays which were certainly written and, with one or two possible exceptions, performed at Oxford or Cambridge in the Tudor period. School and Inns of Court plays, though academic in the wider sense of the phrase, fall outside the limits of this volume."

So rigidly does the author hold himself to the newly imposed limits of his work that he allows formal discussion to no more than fifteen of the twenty-eight academic dramas summarized in the article of Professors Churchill and Keller ('Die lateinischen Universitäts-Dramen in der Zeit der Königin Elisabeth,' *Jahrbuch der dtsh. Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, 1898). Not less than thirty-five other Latin plays included in Dr. Boas's own bibliography are similarly neglected. There is no doubt that the practice is consistent: the plays passed over are not definitely known to have been acted either at Oxford or at Cambridge before the death of Queen Elizabeth. When one considers, however, the haphazard nature of the records of university performances and the accidental preservation of such texts as survive, one doubts whether the scope of even the special Oxford and Cambridge stages can be properly gauged from so small a percentage of the total product. The great majority of the Latin dramas acted in England before the Restoration must have been the work of university men and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, may be fairly taken to represent university taste and practice, even where documentary proof does not set them within the limits of place and time established by Dr. Boas. A reader desirous of acquainting himself with the general nature of academic drama in Shakespeare's time can ill afford, for example, to ignore William Gold-

ingham's *Herodes*, written by a Cambridge scholar about 1570-80, merely because its performance happens not to be recorded; nor can he easily rest satisfied with the purely casual mention of the most famous of all Anglo-Latin comedies, Ruggle's *Ignoramus*, first acted at Cambridge in 1614-15.

Dr. Boas's book fails indeed to offer the definitive study of Anglo-Latin academic drama from the time of George Buchanan to that of Laud, which has long been recognized as an urgent necessity and which the admirable bibliography contributed to the Cambridge History persuaded many students that he had in hand. A very large number of the most interesting plays of this type can still be studied only in the German plot-synopses given in the pioneer work of Churchill and Keller, now nearly twenty years old, or in the necessarily very cursory references of Professor G. C. Moore Smith (cf. especially "Notes on Some English University Plays," *Modern Language Review*, Vol. III).

By thus limiting his discussion of the Latin academic plays, Dr. Boas gains space in his volume for the treatment of two other subjects, closely but not indissolubly associated with the former. The external history of the Oxford and Cambridge college stages during the Tudor era is treated extensively in Chapters I, V, and X, and in parts of VI and VIII. Very minute attention is given also to the small number of extant university plays in English. To the discussion of the Cambridge *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, the Oxford *Caesar and Pompey* and *Narcissus*, and the Cambridge *Club Law* and *Parnassus* trilogy nearly sixty pages are devoted. The criticism of these plays is in all respects excellent, but it may be doubted whether they do not find their most illuminating treatment in connection with the general progress of English vernacular drama—a connection in which most of them have already been copiously discussed. Of the Latin plays which receive detailed attention four—*Hymenaeus*, *Victoria*, *Pedantius*, and *Laelia*, besides the later *Fucus Histriomastix* and the English *Club Law*—have recently been edited by Professor Moore Smith with a thoroughness which,

as Dr. Boas generously recognizes, leaves no great opportunity for fresh elucidation. Practically new ground, however, is broken in the author's discussion of Grimald's *Christus Redivivus* and *Archipropheta*, Christopherson's Greek *Iephthae*, the manuscript *Absalon* of uncertain authorship, Worsley's *Synedrium Animalium*, Gager's Oxford plays, and the Cambridge comedies of *Silvanus*, *Hispanus*, and *Machiavellus*. It is the excellence and unique importance of the pages given to these plays which may perhaps excuse the expression of the otherwise presumptuous wish that the author might have seen fit to devote a larger proportion of his book to the little known department of literature they represent.

The present book is by no means a simple amplification of the forty-page essay on 'University Plays' written five years ago for the *Cambridge History of English Literature*. In addition to the change of scope already alluded to, there are not infrequent alterations of judgment, based on new information or maturer reflection. The interesting evidence proving that the English interlude of *Thersites* is an Oxford play (p. 20 f.) apparently came to the author's attention after the preparation of the earlier article, which makes no mention of this play. That the British Museum Stowe ms. play of *Absalom* is probably identical with the play of the same name known to have been written by Thomas Watson of Cambridge; that *Gammer Gurton's Needle* was composed by William Stevenson; that Halliwell's lost *Dido* was written in hexameter verse; that *Byrsa Basilica* (by J. Ricketts?) was roughly contemporary with the opening of the Royal Exchange in 1570; that Anthony Munday wrote the English counterpart to *Victoria*, called *The Two Italian Gentlemen*; and that the notorious Francis Brackyn, Recorder of Cambridge, is satirized in the Recorder of *The Return from Parnassus* are all current assumptions which Dr. Boas accepted with little question in the *Cambridge History*, but which he sees reason to dispute in his later treatment.

In a volume obviously prepared with the utmost care by the author and printed by the nearly infallible Oxford Press it is surprising

to find even the short list of apparent *errata* which follows:

Preface, p. v, l. 13, 'T e' for 'The.'—P. 18, l. 1, 'eo-Hellenic' for 'neo-Hellenic.'—P. 18, l. 18, 'tragedie' presumably for 'tragedies.'—P. 114, l. 18, 'Richard,' apparently a slip of the pen for 'Richmond' (i. e., Henry VII): 'Bernard André, who had accompanied *Richard* on his invasion of England.'—P. 227, l. 14, 'ther' for 'other.'—P. 413, Index. The page reference after '*Thersites* (the English play)' should be '20, 21' rather than '21-2' as given. On page 254, ll. 18 ff., occurs the only serious error the present reviewer has noted. In a quotation from Stringer's account of Queen Elizabeth's second visit to Oxford as printed in Nichols, *Progresses of Elizabeth*, occurs the following gibberish: "'a long tedious oration made unto hir by the Junior Proctor of the University, about a mile from the in the very edge of their bounds or liberties towards city, Shotover.'" The italics are, of course, mine. In the second edition of the *Progresses of Elizabeth* (1823, Vol. III, p. 160) the passage italicized is given in the following obviously correct form: 'about a mile from the City, in the very edge of their bounds or liberties towards Shotover.' Reference to the printed page will show that the nonsense is chargeable not to Dr. Boas but to the compositor's accidental misplacing of the word 'city,' in altering the alignment after proof had been corrected.

TUCKER BROOKE.

Yale University.

THE RELIGIOUS DRAMA OF THE GERMAN MIDDLE AGES

La théologie dans le drame religieux en Allemagne au moyen âge, par GEORGES DURIEZ. Lille, René Giard, 1914. 8vo., 645 pp.

Les apocryphes dans le drame religieux en Allemagne au moyen âge, par GEORGES DURIEZ. Lille, René Giard, 1914. 8vo., 112 pp.

Taking the words of Creizenach: "Le dramaturge n'invente rien, il emprunte tout

au théologien" as basis, Duriez sets out in his book *La théologie* to search for the sources of the theological accretions with which the medieval dramatists have adorned the simple Christian story as told by the Gospels. These sources, according to Duriez, are "bibliques (Ancien et Nouveau Testament) et extra-bibliques, mais encore théologiques (tradition, apocryphes, Liturgie, Pères, docteurs, exégètes, commentateurs, mystiques" (p. 18).¹ The sermon, which likewise influenced the drama, he leaves out of consideration for the present. "M. l'abbé Petit de Julleville préparant en ce moment un travail sur le sermon au moyen-âge en Allemagne, la comparaison sera par la suite plus aisée" (*ibid.*, Note 27).

The task Duriez sets out to accomplish in this bulky volume is in his own words:

"Partir des mystères insondables de la Trinité, de l'Incarnation et de la Rédemption, dénombrer les habitants du ciel et ceux des enfers, raconter la création de l'homme et son exil du Paradis terrestre, passer en revue les Patriarches et les Prophètes, suivre Jésus dans sa vie cachée et dans sa vie publique, décrire sa Passion, sa mort, sa résurrection et son Ascension, retracer la vie de sa Mère et celle de son négateur, l'Antéchrist, pour conduire mes lecteurs, après les horreurs du jugement dernier, à la béatitude éternelle du ciel" (p. 637).

For his book *Les apocryphes*, for which he has reserved the scenes based exclusively, directly or indirectly, on the Apocryphal books, viz., "l'Interrogatoire de Jésus devant Pilate, avec: 1° la scène du Cursor, 2° des Étendards, 3° des Défenseurs de Jésus, l'Incarcération et mise en liberté de Joseph d'Arimathie, la Descente aux Enfers, l'Assomption de Marie," he takes the keynote from Wülcker. In his scholarly dissertation on the *Evangelium Nicodemi* in Occidental literature² Wülcker (pp. 68-71) states that the Gospel of Nicodemus constitutes one of the sources of the religious drama, and the book under review tries to show to what degree the Apocrypha, especially the *Gesta Pilati* and the *Transitus Beatae Mariae*

Virginis, have inspired the medieval dramatists (*Les apocryphes*, p. 8).

To trace the drama back to its theological source is a great task, and but few are able to handle it.³ Theology is in this modern age a *terra incognita* for most of us.

"La théologie, qui occupait une si grande place dans les études au moyen âge, n'est plus guère en honneur de nos jours que dans les séminaires" (p. 26).

Where will you find in our day and generation a literary critic who is also a theologian? And the impression one gets of these monographs is that the author is indeed at home in the dramatic literature of medieval Germany as well as in the teachings of the Church. One is almost inclined to say that the key-note of these treatises on the medieval religious plays is not only theological, but dogmatical and apologetical, if not homiletical. This is evident from the author's "Discussions sur l'Eucharistie" and "la véritable Église" (pp. 332-348) and "Puissance de Marie" (pp. 571-577), not to mention his "Conclusion," which is a fervent defense of the Church of Rome.

Great as is the task of tracing back the drama to its theological source—"la théologie et le drame sont des domaines si étendus" (p. 637)—, Duriez has acquitted himself of it to the satisfaction of the literary critic as well as of the theologian. Now and then, however, the reader wishes that he had treated the dramatic texts more critically. One gets the impression that the author did not always subject his material to the searching light of textual criticism. Two instances may suffice in illustration. Duriez takes at its face value a stage direction in the Eger Play, which ascribes to Satan a long-winded lamentation over his fall from heaven (p. 67), while a critical study of the characters of Lucifer and Satan in this and the other scenes of the Fall of Angels brings one to the conclusion that it

¹ Wherever the page number alone is given the larger book is meant.

² *Das Evangelium Nicodemi in der abendländischen Literatur*. Paderborn, 1872.

³ Some of the traditions upon which the English miracle plays were founded are very ably traced to their sources by Prof. Gayley in his illuminating book, *Plays of our Forefathers*, pp. 224-278 and Appendix. Miss Bates treats this subject very superficially in *The English Religious Drama*, pp. 160 ff.

could not have been Satan who bemoaned his fall in words of remorse and anguish of soul. Satan was far manlier than Lucifer and submitted to his fate without a single murmur.⁴ It is he who after the fall from heaven summons up all his powers of oratory to cheer and console his crest-fallen and despairing lord and master. The superscription in the Eger Play, which credits Satan with this heart-rending tale of woe is as erroneous⁵ as the stage direction of the Vienna Easter play, which, strangely enough, ascribes the lamentations of the hell lord after his defeat at the hands of Christ (Hoffmann von Fallersleben, *Fundgruben II*, 307, ll. 13-22) to Caiphas and Annas.⁶ Duriez also considers *Seltenfrum* as a separate individual (p. 104), while this is only another name for the devil *Tutevillus*.⁷

The reader will hardly find fault with Duriez for not confining himself to the period mentioned in the title of his books, and including later texts even down to the Oberammergau Passion play of our own day. What constitutes, however, a great defect in these treatises on the medieval religious drama is the omission of a few valuable medieval texts. One certainly cannot reproach Duriez for confining himself to printed texts and leaving out of account the manuscripts, which have so far not appeared in print. An author living in a foreign country has good cause to congratulate himself if he can get hold of all printed texts, and should be reasonable enough not to expect German libraries and museums to send him manuscripts for examination. We should, however, expect M. Duriez to know of the publication of the Klosterneuburger Easter play by Pfeiffer.⁸ He knows only of "quelques frag-

ments publiés au XIXe siècle par Bernard Pez dans son *Thesaurus Anecdotorum* d'après un ms. du XIIe siècle de Klosterneuburg, qui, depuis lors, a disparu" (p. 479).⁹ This Latin text from the beginning of the thirteenth century, which has recently been found again, is of great importance to the student of the religious drama. To our knowledge it contains the first and only scene of *Descensus Christi ad Inferos* in the Latin language. But this is not the only medieval text lacking in Duriez's works. We miss also the Sterzing Christmas play of the year 1511. Next to the Hessian play, to which it shows great similarity,¹⁰ this text is the most interesting Christmas drama of which we so far have any record. It marks the point of decay of the religious drama, for some of its scenes might as well have formed a part of a Shrovetide farce. Strange to say, Duriez mentions this play in his list of works consulted, and yet ignores it in his text. Did it perhaps reach him too late to be incorporated in his work? If so, why not a note to this effect in the Conclusion?

But M. Duriez states that he has consulted many other books, though we look in vain in his text for any mention of them. My essay on the prophet and disputation scenes in the religious drama of medieval Germany¹¹ is mentioned in his bibliographical list, but he seems to have profited very little by the reading of this little work. He would otherwise have found there the biblical source for many a prophetic quotation in the dramatic texts, a point on which he repeatedly confesses ignorance. And yet I almost feel inclined to say that Duriez has read my essay. We find in his book (pp. 239-241) the same explanation of the pseudo-Habakkuk prophecy "in medio duorum ani-

⁴ Cf. p. 119 of my monograph *Der Teufel in den deutschen geistlichen Spielen des Mittelalters und der Reformationszeit*. Hesperia, Heft 6. Göttingen und Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1915.

⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 109, footnote.

⁶ Cf. Höpfner, *Untersuchungen zu dem Innsbrucker, Berliner und Wiener Osterspiel*. Germ. Abhandlungen, 45. Heft, p. 124.

⁷ Cf. *Der Teufel*, etc., p. 98, note 3.

⁸ *Klosterneuburger Osterfeier und Osterspiel*. Jahrbuch des Stiftes Klosterneuburg I (Wien, 1908). Text pp. 27-40.

⁹ The date Duriez gives for the publication of the *Thesaurus* is erroneous. The work *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus* (*Dissert. isagog.*) in twelve volumes appeared 1721-1729. The fragment of the Klosterneuburg Easter Play is to be found in vol. II, p. liii.

¹⁰ Cf. R. Jordan, *Das Sterzinger Weihnachtsspiel vom Jahre 1511 und das hessische Weihnachtsspiel*. Schulprogramm. Krumau 1902, p. 1.

¹¹ *Die Prophetensprüche und -zitate im religiösen Drama des deutschen Mittelalters*. Leipzig, 1913.

malium" that I have given in footnote 2 on the last page of my pamphlet and afterwards elaborated in *Modern Language Notes*.¹² If M. Duriez consulted my essay, but had already independently come to this conclusion, why did he not insert a footnote to this effect?

The chapter "Les démons et l'enfer" covers the same ground as the first part of my monograph on the Devil, with the distinction, however, that M. Duriez confines himself to the tracing of the theological sources of Devil and Hell in the medieval religious drama of Germany.

In regard to the prophet scenes the author and I seem to be at issue. According to his Introduction M. Duriez hopes to succeed

"à convaincre le lecteur que le moyen âge a connu la Bible, ce dont certains critiques et non des moindres ont paru douter" (p. 19), "du moins en ce qui concerne les auteurs de mystères allemands, car," he goes on to say, "il est impossible de lire un drame religieux comme celui d'Eger, d'Alsfeld ou de Heidelberg, sans être frappé de la connaissance approfondie que les auteurs avaient de la Bible et en particulier des évangiles" (p. 20).

But a familiarity with the Christian story by no means presupposes a profound knowledge of the Gospels, as Duriez would have us believe. If the common people in the Middle Ages were well familiar with the life-history of their Savior, how much more must we expect this from the clergy? And even granted that the German medieval dramatists knew the Gospels, their ignorance of the Old Testament, a fact which many critics maintain, is not yet refuted. Old Testament prefigurations in a play like the Heidelberg drama do not prove that the author knew the Old Testament. He may have known the Old Testament stories, but the text may have been a book with seven seals for him. Duriez acknowledges that the medieval dramatists did not know the patristic and apocryphic writings (*Les apocryphes*, pp. 44, 72). He

agrees with M. Mâle that "toute la littérature connue des chrétiens du moyen âge se réduisait à quelques ouvrages qui formaient un résumé de tout ce qui avait été dit dans les âges précédents (including the Bible?)" (pp. 21-22). I fully agree with Duriez that

"les auteurs de ces drames étaient des ecclésiastiques, séculiers ou réguliers, sans cesse en contact avec la Sainte Écriture par la récitation de leur bréviaire, la célébration du saint sacrifice et l'administration des sacrements, aussi bien que par leurs lectures des quelques ouvrages qui formaient un résumé de tout ce qui avait été dit dans les âges précédents" (p. 20), but believe that all their biblical knowledge came only through these channels. Of course, one must guard himself against generalizations and admit that now and then an author may have directly drawn on the Vulgate. For my part, I am willing to admit this for Arnoldus Immensen.¹³ If the dramatists were familiar with the biblical texts, the prophetic quotations in the dramas would have corresponded perfectly to their biblical sources, but this is far from being the case, as I have shown in my essay on the prophet scenes. Duriez acknowledges this contention to be true of the Benediktbeuren Christmas play (p. 157) and the Tegernsee Antichrist play (p. 588). He admits that he cannot find the corresponding biblical passage for Daniel's Messianic prophecy in the Frankfort Passion play, ll. 133-160 (p. 206),¹⁴ and of the testimony of Ezekiel, on which the prophet Isaiah bases his famous oracle "*Ecce virgo concipiet*" (Innsbr. Easter play, ll. 136; 173-176).¹⁵ In this case, as in many others, the dramatist credits one prophet with the words of another. Did he do this consciously? Was it not rather ignorance of the real authorship of Messianic prophecies which he knew from the liturgy and the liturgy only? Duriez admits "ne pas avoir retrouvé cette harmonie entre le prophète et le drame" (p.

¹³ Cf. F. Krage, *Vorarbeiten zu einer Neu-Ausgabe von Arnold Immensen, Der Sündenfall*. Rostock Diss., Heidelberg, 1912, p. 58. (This dissertation forms the first part of Krage's edition of this play, *Germ. Bibliothek*, II. Abt., 8. Bd., Heidelberg, 1913.)

¹⁴ The biblical passage is Dan. 9: 26.

¹⁵ The corresponding biblical passage is Jer. 7: 14.

¹² *Zum Verhältnis des religiösen Dramas zur Liturgie der Kirche*. *Modern Language Notes*, XXIX, 108-109. See also my papers "The Origin of the Legend of Bos et Asinus" and "Bos et Asinus Again," in *The Open Court*, XXIX, pp. 57, 191-192.

614), and he emphasizes in many places the influence of the liturgy rather than the Bible on the drama (cf. pp. 158-160, 369, 374, 495, 531, 577). The best proof, however, that it was the liturgy and not the Bible which furnished the prophecies for the drama is furnished by the pseudo-Habbakuk prophecy "in media duorum animalium." For this passage is not to be found in the Vulgate, and it could have been known to the dramatists only through the liturgy. It is true that the Septuagint contains this erroneous passage, but even Duriez will not claim an acquaintance with the Greek text for the medieval dramatists. It is somewhat unfair on the part of Duriez to accuse those who doubt the familiarity of the medieval dramatists with the Bible of "mal connaître l'esprit du catholicisme" (p. 19). In our appreciation of the church of the Middle Ages we are not behind those who claim a knowledge of the Bible for the medieval clergy.

I do not, however, wish to detract from the merits of this book. Duriez has made a notable contribution to the study of the German religious drama, and while Wilmotte's purpose in his studies always was to prove the dependence of the German religious plays on the French, Duriez claims a common source for both, namely, the common teachings of the Church. The task of tracing the drama to its theological source was gigantic and tedious, for—in the author's own words—"les longs drames du moyen âge finissent par être fastidieux, et qui en a lu un, en a lu vingt," but Duriez has done it well and gladly. The closing words of his Introduction (p. 27) will—possibly with a few slight modifications for some of us—find an echo in the hearts of all who have made a study of the medieval religious drama:

"J'ai pourtant fini par les aimer, malgré leur dure écorce; car ils envisagent au fond des questions pour moi capitales: Dieu, Jésus-Christ, la Sainte Vierge, l'Église; et sous leur forme fruste ils sont les sûrs témoins de l'amour des siècles de foi pour tout ce qu'il y a de beau, pour tout ce qu'il y a de grand."

MAXIMILIAN JOSEF RUDWIN.

Purdue University.

RECENT LEOPARDI LITERATURE

Leopardi sentimental. Essai de psychologie leopardenne suivi du *Journal d'amour*, inédit en français, par N. SERBAN. Paris, Champion, 1913. 8vo., 247 pp.

Leopardi et la France. Essai de littérature comparée, par N. SERBAN. Paris, Champion, 1913. 8vo., xix + 551 pp.

Lettres inédites relatives à Giacomo Leopardi, publiées avec introduction, notes et appendices par N. SERBAN. Paris, Champion, 1913. 8vo., xxiv + 260 pp.

Dr. Serban, a Roumanian who has taken a real French doctorate, has in these three books made substantial contributions to three different fields of Leopardi literature. The first of these, *Leopardi sentimental*, shows more fully than has before been done the subjective causes of the poet's pessimism. A poet, particularly a lyric poet, is *ipso facto* an egoist, and all his environment, all his experience of life were such as only to emphasize this tendency in the Italian poet. Dr. Serban has shown how Leopardi's philosophy of life, of religion, and of the world were the results of the contact of a sensitive nature with actual life, the intellectual reaction of his unhappy loves on himself. Nowhere can a critic find a better opportunity for approaching the understanding of a genius by a study of his near relatives than in the case of Leopardi. His father's latent sentimentalism was revealed in an erotic form in the two brothers and one sister of the poet, while in the last its thwarted aims found literary expression in a philosophy of pessimism. From the date of his sentimental conversion, the day he met his first love, Leopardi felt the shock of the difference between his inner life and the outer world, and this feeling was only intensified by ill-success in his subsequent love affairs, due to the lack of physical charms and of health. Even his scholarly industry was the result of a reaction, a nepenthe to

drown the wakeful anguish of the soul.

The spasms and convulsions of a wounded heart were his measure for the universe. On account

of the important part his sentimental conversion played in the poet's life, Dr. Serban has republished, with a French translation, the *Diario d'Amore*, which is a remarkable bit of self-analysis to be written at nineteen, even by a great genius.

Leopardi et la France is a logical continuation of *Leopardi sentimental*; it is the history of the poet's intellectual progress, as the latter is a study of his emotional history. It is at once the satire of fate, and yet a natural thing, that Leopardi should find the material for his sceptical philosophy in French books in the library of his bigoted Gallophobe father, who, if we are to believe his own statement, had selected the books for the sake of his son's education. In doing so he had not included in the collection of 20,000 volumes such partisan writers as Molière and Racine, and yet had not denied admittance to the works of Voltaire and the *Encyclopédie*. In tracing Leopardi's readings, Dr. Serban was fortunate in having two guides, the library of Monaldo Leopardi at Recanati, where he worked among the French books—the list of which he has published in an appendix—, and the seven volumes of the poet's note-books, known as the *Zibaldone*. He has shown how French literary influence first appears in the juvenilia of the poet, in liberal textual borrowings. Thus, the *Pompeo in Egitto* (1811) has its chief source in Rollin, and the *Dissertazione sopra l'origine e i primi progressi dell'Astronomia* (1814) was based largely on Goguet's *De l'origine des loix* and Pluche's *Histoire du Ciel*. The *Saggio sopra gli Errori popolari* (1815) was suggested by the preface to Pluche's work, and one of its chief, if unacknowledged, sources was the *Encyclopédie*. If it professedly makes a plea for Catholic orthodoxy, there is evidence of an independent spirit of doubt, which was first stimulated by the logical methods of his French authorities, and not spontaneously, or through the influence of Giordani, as has been conjectured.

But it is in his later French readings commencing with 1818 that Leopardi found the material for his philosophy. As he states, it was only after reading several of the works of

Madame de Staël that he believed himself to be a philosopher. His *Discorso sullo stato presente dei costumi degl'Italiani* (1824) and the first years of the *Zibaldone* show how he tried to make his own her views on racial affinities and distinctions. To her he is indebted for both his information and his opinions in regard to the English and Germans, while he glazes her romantic presentation of his own countrymen with the tone of his own sombre spirit. For the French he had at first an antipathy, due at once to his home breeding and to the evils the Napoleonic conquest had brought his native country. Then, too, he found in their individual attitude to Italians that condescension of foreigners which was to impress our Lowell. If they were emphatically a social nation, they were conventional, and lacked charm and simplicity. But with a more extended reading, he acknowledged what modern literatures owed to French models, and Italy's debt was only increased by French political domination. In Madame de Staël's theories in regard to the difference between the expression of grief in ancient and modern art, and its causes, he found reason to discard his earlier belief in the existence of an unchanging canon of beauty. But he had been prepared for a change of opinion by an earlier reading of Montesquieu's *Essai sur le goût*, which insisted on the influence of the character, manners, and conventions of different peoples upon their tastes in art and literature. Again, if the French authoress furnished him with the quintessence of romanticism—the emphasis laid on sentiment, the supreme position of lyric poetry, the enhancement of the imagination and enthusiasm, the taste for the indeterminate and vague, the anguish of the infinite—, the distinctively eighteenth-century aesthetic treatise had already revealed to him the importance of the sensation of the infinite and vague in art, one of a number of Montesquieu's aesthetic principles of which Leopardi only enlarged the scope to make them basic principles of his own pessimistic philosophy. Montesquieu declared that the infinity of man's desires for pleasure led him to love the infinite, the indeterminate and the vague, and that even the most varied

real pleasures being incapable of satisfying his desires, he must find a compensation in the pleasures of the imagination. From these dicta the Italian poet deduced the impossibility for man to be ever fully satisfied, which, joined to Rousseau's theories on the fatal consequences of human progress and the conceptions of Frederick II in regard to the indifference of nature to man, completed his own system of negation.

Dr. Serban has done a great service in pointing out the literary sources of Leopardi's philosophy of life. The source of Leopardi's remarks on the causes of France's taking the initiative in literary and social life has escaped him, and led him to make a statement beside the mark (166-167): "C'est en vain qu'on chercherait trace de ces opinions dans les auteurs français. Elles ne peuvent venir que d'un esprit ignorant de la société française." Montesquieu not only emphasizes the social characteristics of the French in the phrase cited from the *Lettres persanes*; a general statement in a chapter of the *Esprit des Lois* (XIX, 8) on the "Effet de l'humeur sociable" has been made more specific and its scope enlarged by Leopardi (*Zibaldone*, IV, 1-2), even if the second work was "prohibito" in Monaldo Leopardi's library (Serban, 137-138). One is surprised to find La Rochefoucauld, whose work was accessible to the poet (22, 124, 126, 476), not even mentioned as a possible source of Leopardi's philosophy, even if he is not referred to in the *Zibaldone*; for the poet notes, among the works he thinks of composing, "Massime morali sull'andare di Epitt. Rochefoucauld ec." (*Scritti vari inediti di G. Leopardi dalle carte Napoletane*, 395).

The second part of the book, on the interpretation and influence of Leopardi in French, is not so original in its results as the first part, but presents much that is of interest. A chapter is devoted to a well-justified rehabilitation of the poet's Swiss friend Louis de Sinner, whose services in promoting the reputation of Leopardi were as important in their way as were those of Ranieri and Giordani. He edited the philological works for the press, he translated into French three of the *Dialoghi*, and, most important, he supplied Sainte-Beuve with

the information and documents on which the supreme critic based his article which made the Italian poet a cosmopolitan figure. From the evidence afforded by his chapters on French editions, translations and biographical and critical articles, Dr. Serban considers that Leopardi is the one Italian author of the nineteenth century who has had a certain continuous popularity in France. A chapter on the literary influence is even more negative in its results for the reader than for the author. Different in temperament as were Musset and Leopardi, the French poet knew, and showed he could appreciate, the latter's work, but came to know it too late in life to be influenced by it. If the thought of Alfred de Vigny's late poetry can be paralleled with Leopardi's, if in *la Maison du berger* one finds that the solidarity of mankind is the only remedy against the indifference of nature as in *la Ginestra*, it is not a case of borrowing, a chronological possibility, as Dr. Serban points out; it is because the two poets might have addressed each other most appropriately with Verlaine's verse:

Ames sœurs que nous sommes.

The *Lettres inédites relatives à Giacomo Leopardi*, might have as a sub-title *Contributions à la censure de la presse*, as the greater part is devoted to the letters written by the poet's friend Ranieri to the publisher Le Monnier, in regard to the edition of the works of the poet, published at Florence in 1845. The writer's character appears in a most amiable light. Without any pecuniary advantage to himself, he shows himself the faithful trustee of the poet's literary remains, insisting that they be printed in their complete and unchanged text. He had wished, and even prepared (cf. 97, n.), to print them in a country free of ecclesiastical censorship, but on the assurance of the publisher that an accommodating censor could be found to read the manuscripts, he consented to their publication in Florence. The censor did not prove to be accommodating, but Le Monnier was ready to incorporate his foot-notes with Leopardi's own, and to print another censor's *Avvertenze*, "prediche sulla fede cattolica, sulla individualità

di Leopardi, etc.," as prefaces to the poems or essays, of which the orthodoxy was dubious. Ranieri had to remind the publisher that they were publishing "*Leopardi, non LEOPARDI CONFUTATO*" (96), and Le Monnier compromised by printing the censor's notes at the end of the *Canti* and of the *Operette morali*, in the first volume, and by putting the *Avvertenze* at the end of the volumes, for the contents of which they were to serve as an antidote. The latter have been reprinted by Dr. Serban (245-250), and their every inane phrase is an excellent argument for the foundation of a United Italy.

Le Monnier played Ranieri false another time (163-183), out of fear of a loss in the sale of his publications in "qualche contrada d'Italia, dominata da' Gesuiti" (175), by not wishing to reprint his refutation of the Jesuit slander that Leopardi had died converted in the arms of a member of the order. It is worthy of noting in the same connection that Montanari's own copy of his *Elogio biografico* of Leopardi was incomplete, having suffered at the hands of the censor of the Roman States (220), and that Ranieri warned Le Monnier not to write to him by post in regard to Leopardi (118); for "una troppa maggiore sicurezza" (169), mail was sent in an unofficial way by steamers, going from Naples to Pisa, so as to escape the postal censors. A number of evident mistakes made in transcribing the letters could be pointed out. It is enough to note that the book of Leopardi which Creuzer considered not worth publishing in German, even in extracts (13; cf. *Leopardi et la France*, 271), was the *Saggio sopra gli Errori popolari degli antichi*. As he states, this juvenile work of the poet contained only material generally known to the learned world since the publication of the *De origine et progressu idolatriæ, sive de theologia gentili* of Gerard John Vossius, for it is to this latter work that Creuzer refers in the phrase "*Lib. Gyraldus. Germ. Vossini*," which Dr. Serban found "presque indéchiffrable," and which he does not undertake to interpret.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

Cornell University.

CORRESPONDENCE

A NOTE ON VOLUME TWO OF THE 1640 FOLIO OF BEN JONSON'S PLAYS

The paging of the first three plays in this volume of the folio is as follows: *Bartholomew Fair*, pages 1-88; *Staple of News*, pages 1-75; *Devil is an Ass*, pages 93-170. The question has been as to what occupied the pages between page 75 of *Staple of News*, and page 93 of *Devil is an Ass*.

The Elizabethan Club of Yale has separate folio copies of *Bartholomew Fair* and *Devil is an Ass*. A study of these brought to light the fact that the numbering of the pages of these two plays is, allowing for one blank leaf between them, consecutive. This fact points to these two plays having appeared in one volume, and *Staple of News* in a separate volume, before the folio was made up. The Elizabethan Club copies are of slightly different size, and have different markings in the binding left on their backs. This shows them to have come from different copies.

FLORENCE M. SNELL.

Yale University.

O PROPER STUFF!—*Macbeth*, III, iv, 60

These words seem, so far, to have baffled all the commentators. No real definition of either the separate words or of the phrase as a whole has been offered, and the explanations given are but the purest guesses. The phrase is not, perhaps, of vital importance to an understanding of the play, but correctly interpreted it throws some light upon one of the most important aspects of the play, and helps to make clear the relations of Lady Macbeth to her lord and to his crimes.

None of the comments that I can find shows any appreciation of the words of the phrase, but all alike content themselves with an attempt to define the subjective mood of the speaker. Clark and Wright, in the Clarendon

Press edition of the play, give this explanation: "Mere or absolute nonsense, rubbish. We have 'proper' used in a contemptuous exclamation in *Much Ado about Nothing*, i, 3, 54, and iv, 1, 312. For 'stuff' see *Measure for Measure*, iii, 2, 5, and *I Henry IV*, iii, I, 154." Furness gives only the Clarendon note, and Editor II adds a quotation from Scott. Rolfe's note is obviously a restatement of the same conception: "Ironical and contemptuous. Proper (=fine, pretty, etc.) is often so used." These citations will suffice, for most other editors simply follow the Clarendon note without comment of their own.

Nor do the Shakespearean lexicons take us any nearer the true meaning. Schmidt's *Lexikon* gives two uses of "stuff," the second of which is: "Especially things spoken or recited: Usually in contempt," and for which our passage is cited as an instance. Cunliffe's *New Shakespearean Dictionary* does not give any definition of "stuff," and under the definition of "proper" does not cite this passage. Neither the commentaries nor the dictionaries, then, have given us the true meaning.

The words are spoken by Lady Macbeth to her lord just after their company have sat down to the Banquet. Macbeth has declined to be seated, for, as he says, "The table's full." He sees the ghost of Banquo in his place, but as no one else seems to see it his words are not understood. The guests are about to rise because of Macbeth's strange actions and words, when Lady Macbeth urges them to keep their seats, assuring them that "The fit is momentary." When chided for his behavior, Macbeth excuses himself by referring to the sight as that "Which might appal the devil." Then Lady Macbeth says to him

O proper stuff!

This is the very painting of your fear:

This is the air-drawn dagger which, you said,
Led you to Duncan.

That is, she is telling him that what he now sees is but the projection of his own inner fear, and is but another vision of "the air-drawn dagger," which came entirely from his own

mind, or as she puts it is his own (proper) stuff.

The use of "stuff," in a subjective sense, for the things of the mind or spirit, is common enough in Shakespeare. It is used again in this sense in the last act of the play where Macbeth asks the Doctor if he cannot

Cleanse the stuff'd bosom of that perilous stuff
Which weighs upon the heart? (*V*, iii, 44-5.)

It is also used in a similar sense in several other plays, of which the following are the two most important:

My lord, there was no such stuff in my thoughts.
Hamlet, II, ii, 324.

Yet do I hold it very stuff o' the conscience
To do no contrived murder. *Othello*, I, ii, 2-3.

In two passages the word "stuff" is associated with "dream," and has a somewhat similar connotation:

'Tis still a dream, or else such stuff as madmen
Tongue and brain not. *Cymbeline*, V, iv, 146-7.

We are such stuff
As dreams are made on. *Tempest*, IV, i, 156-7.

There need be no difficulty with "proper," the other word in the phrase.¹ It is very frequently used, as here, in the etymological sense of "one's own" (Latin, *proprius* = 'one's own'). Two examples of this use will suffice: "My proper life," *Hamlet*, V, ii, 66; and "Our own proper son," *Othello*, I, ii, 97.

This interpretation makes it clear that Lady Macbeth does not at any time see the ghost of Banquo, and that Macbeth's vision is but the fear that arises from his guilty conscience. Lady Macbeth has apparently had no part in the murder, for it is not on her conscience, but only on her lord's. With the murder of Duncan her superior moral nature had all but col-

¹C. T. Onions (*A Shakespeare Glossary*, Oxford, 1911) recognizes the required meaning of *stuff*, "matter, in a fig. sense," though he does not cite the passage here discussed. He also reads *proper* in a number of passages with the meaning 'one's own,' but cites the passage here discussed as illustrating the meaning "excellent, capital, fine (ironically)." —J. W. B.

lapsed, and Macbeth had to commit all the other crimes himself. The play is therefore primarily the story of Macbeth and his crimes, for not only the visions of daggers before the deeds, but the visions of ghosts afterward, are all his "proper stuff," or the projection of his mind alone.

A. W. CRAWFORD.

University of Manitoba.

BUT ME NO BUTS

Bartlett, in his *Familiar Quotations* (ninth edition, pp. 861-2), gives nineteen examples of the use by English writers of phrases formed on the analogy of "But me no buts." Chronologically they run from Shakespeare and Peele to Tennyson and Bulwer-Lytton; alphabetically from "But me no buts" and "Cause me no causes" to "Virgin me no virgins" and "Vow me no vows." I have from time to time noted other uses of this form of speech in various English plays, and they may be worth recording.

"Blurt me no blurts." Middleton: *Blurt, Master Constable*, iv, 3.

"Confer me no conferrings." Shirley: *The Wedding*, iv, 3.

"Good me no goods." Beaumont and Fletcher: *The Chances*, i, 8.

"Hear me no hears." Porter: *Two Angry Women*, i, 2.

"Heart me no hearts." *The same*, ii, 4.

"Leave me no leaving." Ford: *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, i, 2.

"Lord me no lords." Shirley: *Hyde Park*, v, 1.

"Star me no stars." Shirley: *The Wedding*, v, 2.

"Take me no takes." Shirley: *Hyde Park*, ii, 2.

"Treat me no treatings." Wycherley: *Love in a Wood*, iii, 2.

"But me no buts," which Bartlett quotes from Fielding and Aaron Hill, has been used in the anonymous play *Wine, Beere, Ale and Tobacco* in 1630. "Madam me no madams,"

which he refers to Dryden's *Wild Gallant*, the same writer had used in his *Evening's Love*, act iii, sc. 1. While it would be interesting to know of any earlier use of this locution, it is worth noting that it crops up in contemporary writers. The Baroness Von Hutten, in the *Green Patch* (1910, p. 330), has "Only me no onlies." An English critic, in a notice of Strauss's *Fledermaus* in 1910, indignantly exclaimed "Fleder me no fledermice!" and finally, I noticed in the *Woman's Home Companion* for October, 1911, the phrase "Jest me no jests."

ALFRED CLAGHORN POTTER.

Harvard College Library.

BELLS RINGING WITHOUT HANDS

Reviving the subject of bells ringing without hands, in the *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXX, p. 28, Mr. Phillips Barry has given an admirable collection of the earliest cases of the belief. May I round it off by giving the latest? One of the present warring monarchs is said to have issued a proclamation to the Poles last fall, reminding them that, it would seem very recently, the bell of the Holy Swiatogorsky monastery began to ring at night without human aid, and that the pious recognized this as signaling a great event; to wit, according to the monarch, the present war and all the beneficent results sure to follow. This was quoted in the *Chicago Tribune* (31 Oct., 1914) from the *Gazetta* of Czenstochowa, in Russian Poland near the German border, by way of Petrograd. The monastery in question is undoubtedly the ancient and celebrated Jasnagóra monastery in Czenstochowa, its name (Bright Mountain) being translated into Russian as Swiatogorsky. The rest of the proclamation is also interesting to students of the past. Whatever the authenticity of the report, it shows the belief is still living in eastern Europe.

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK.

University of Michigan.